

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 788

HARRY BRIDGES, PETITIONER,

**E. F. WILSON, AS DISTRICT DIRECTOR, IMMIGRA-
TION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, DEPART-
MENT OF JUSTICE,**

**ON WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

WRITING FOR CERTIORARI FILED DECEMBER 21, 1944

CERTIORARI GRANTED JANUARY 24, 1945

No. 10450

**United States
Circuit Court of Appeals**

For the Ninth Circuit.

HARRY BRIDGES,

Appellant,

vs.

**I. F. WIXON, as District Director, Immigration
and Naturalization Service, Department of
Justice,**

Appellee

Transcript of Record

VOLUME V

Pages 1917 to 2399

**Upon Appeal from the District Court of the United States
for the Northern District of California,
Northern Division.**

AMOS FLOYD KELLEY

called as a witness on behalf of the Government,
having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is your name?

A. Amos Floyd Kelley—K-e-l-l-e-y.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Kelley?

A. Seattle.

Q. Seattle, Washington? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?

A. Hotel keeper.

Q. Hotel keeper. For how long a period have you been a hotel keeper?

A. Since about 1921.

Q. And at what hotel?

A. Since 1934 I was in the Atwood Hotel in Seattle.

Q. The Atwood Hotel in Seattle?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as hotel keeper did you keep a hotel register? A. Yes, sir.

Q. I show you what appears to be a register for Saturday, [1198] May 1, 1937, and ask you if that is the hotel register for the Hotel Atwood, of Seattle, Washington, for that day.

A. (Examining register) Yes, sir.

Q. Does the name of Harry Bridges appear on that register? A. It does.

Q. What does it show?

A. It shows that he had File No. 5665, and

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

registered as H. R. Bridges, of San Francisco, and I put him in Room 121. I roomed him myself.

Q. How long did he remain at that hotel, if you know?

A. I couldn't say off-hand without my reference book.

Q. Is this your reference book?

A. (Examining book) Yes.

Q. Can you tell me the page here, so I can show it to counsel?

A. (Examining reference book) Right here. It was 5/2 to 5/23.

Q. 5/2 to 5/23.

A. Yes; that is May 2 to May 23.

Q. What year? A. 1937.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this register in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order. I ask that we be permitted to withdraw this and substitute a photostatic copy. [1190]

Presiding Inspector: That will be permitted. It will be received and marked.

(The register referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 213.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I also offer the page in this reference book for the year 1937, which the witness has identified in evidence, and ask we be permitted to photostat that particular page and substitute it for the original.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Presiding Inspector: It may be received and that practice may be followed.

(The sheet from reference book referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 214.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Kelley, do you recognize the Harry Bridges that you registered at that hotel?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as indicated by the records?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is he?

A. Right there. (Indicating)

Mr. Del Guercio: May the record show that he has identified the Alien?

Presiding Inspector: It may show it.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you have a conversation with the Alien there [1200] at the hotel at the time he registered?

A. I did.

Q. Or any time afterwards?

A. I don't recall any particular conversation at the time he registered. I did a short while after that.

Q. Where was that? A. In room 305.

Q. That is the room in which he was registered?

A. No, sir.

Q. In what room was that?

A. He was registered in 121.

1920

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. And what was in room 305, whose room was that? A. Dutch Dietrich.

Q. And who was present?

A. Dutch Dietrich, myself and Mr. Bridges.

Q. And you say that that was the same day that Bridges had registered? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the conversation you had with the Alien?

A. I told Mr. Dietrich that I would like to meet Harry Bridges, that I had heard so much about him, so he had a room there and when Harry came in, evidently he invited Harry over to his room to have a drink; and Dietrich called me on the phone and asked me to come up and have a drink with them.

So I went up to have a drink with them. Harry was lying on [1201] the bed and Dutch was acting as bartender, Dutch Dietrich.

After we had had a few drinks, not to exceed three, and were discussing several different issues, Dutch Dietrich commented to Dutch—or to Bridges, that "Harry, you are one of the swelldest guys I have ever known if it wasn't for that Commie outfit that you belong to."

Q. What did the Alien say to that?

A. He said, "That is all right. You will see the time that you are damned glad to belong to our outfit."

Q. What did you understand the "Commie" outfit to be?

A. I later asked Dietrich what he meant by that,

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

and he says "It is the Communists. Didn't you know that Bridges belongs to that outfit?"

I said, "No. How would I know it?"

Q. Now, Mr. Kelley, I will show you another, what purports to be a hotel register for the day 8/5/37, a Thursday, and ask you if that is the register of the Hotel Atwood, your Hotel Atwood, at Seattle? A. (Examining register) Yes, sir.

Q. Does the name of Harry Bridges appear on that register?

A. Yes, sir. He registered under the name of "H. Bridges, San Francisco," and my son registered him in.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order. I ask [1202] that we be permitted to make photostats of it and substitute it for the original.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received and that practice will be followed.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 215.)

Mr. Del Guercio: You may cross examine.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Kelley, when was the first time you were contacted by any representative of the Government with respect to being a witness in this case?

A. I would say about three or four months ago.

Q. By whom were you contacted?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

A. By an FBI man; I don't recall the name.

Q. Where were you contacted?

A. At my home.

Q. What did he say to you when he first approached you?

A. The exact conversation I am not positive of, but he asked me if I recalled having a conversation with Mr. Bridges, and anyone else in the Atwood Hotel, at any particular time, and I told him I recalled this incident I just described.

Q. Then what did he say?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment, if your Honor please. I will have to object to this line of questioning. It isn't [1203] cross examination. It isn't on anything material to the issue in this case. We are not trying the FBI. This is a proceeding here to determine whether the Alien, Harry Bridges, is subject to deportation.

Presiding Inspector: We are not trying the FBI, but I think I will receive it. It may have some bearing on the credibility of the witness. That, I suppose, is the purpose of the cross examination.

Mr. Del Guercio: If it is—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) I don't know what the FBI man said. Apparently Mr. Del Guercio don't want me to find out.

Mr. Del Guercio: No, no.

Mr. Grossman: It may be relevant, what the FBI man said and what Mr. Kelley said.

f

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What did he say?

A. He asked if I would be willing to volunteer the knowledge as evidence in a deportation proceeding.

Q. What did you say?

A. I advised him that I had no other alternative if I was subpoenaed.

Q. Did he refresh your memory very much about this incident?

A. No, he did not.

Q. Do you remember the incident at the time you talked to [1203-A] the FBI man as well as you remember it now?

A. I do.

Q. Will you repeat again how much he described the incident before he asked you about it?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute. I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: If he described it at all. He testified he didn't.

Mr. Grossman: To some extent he did.

Presiding Inspector: You don't want him to repeat it.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, to be sure I have it correct.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How much did he describe it before he asked you about it?

A. There was hardly a description at all, except that a certain conversation was to have been carried on at the Atwood Hotel, and if I remembered what the nature of the conversation was.

1974

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. Did he tell between whom this conversation was? A. No.

Q. Is it your testimony that the FBI man came to you and said, "Was there a certain conversation at"—what hotel? A. Atwood Hotel.

Q. (Continuing) —"at the Atwood Hotel," and in reply to that question you gave him the information that you just testified to?

A. Yes, sir. [1203-B]

Q. You are sure that that is all he said in describing the conversation?

A. Not every word he said, no, but it was practically the thing that he meant; he wanted to know what I knew in regard to the matter.

Q. Did he mention that the conversation held with Harry Bridges, that is, involved Harry Bridges?

A. He asked me if it occurred, and if it was with Harry Bridges.

Q. Did he mention Harry Bridges before or after you answered him?

Presiding Inspector: Well, wasn't this testimony that he asked him whether he had a conversation with Harry Bridges?

Mr. Grossman: I asked him to give me all the details that the FBI man gave him. He didn't put in the element of Harry Bridges, according to his previous answer.

Presiding Inspector: You may be right about that.

Mr. Grossman: I am sure of it; I am positive of it.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Reporter, go back to the question and answer where the witness mentioned the first time what the FBI man said to him.

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter as follows:

"Q What did he say to you when he first approached you?

"A The exact conversation I am not positive of, but he [1203-C] asked me if I recalled having a conversation with Mr. Bridges, and anyone else in the Atwood Hotel, at any particular time, and I told him I recalled this incident I just described.")

Presiding Inspector: You see, Bridges' name was mentioned at the start. That is the first thing that was said.

Do not deceive the witness.

Mr. Grossman: May we have the second question read, the one I asked after that?

Presiding Inspector: But he already said he remembered the matter with Harry Bridges.

Mr. Grossman: May I have the second one read?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Grossman: I think he changed it in the second one. I asked a second question to get it positive.

Presiding Inspector: What?

Mr. Grossman: I asked a second question to confirm it.

Presiding Inspector: It didn't need any confirmation. You had a direct statement.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Mr. Grossman: I would like to have it read.

Presiding Inspector: Go back and read the first question and answer previously read and then continue on.

(The reporter read that portion of the record referred to as recorded above.)

Presiding Inspector: That is enough. He already told you that was the very first thing he said. Go ahead and ask the next question. [1204]

Mr. Grossman: If your Honor please—

Presiding Inspector: No argument. Ask the next question. [1205]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever discuss this conversation prior to the time that FBI man came to see you?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, with whom?

Mr. Grossman: With anyone.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I will exclude that; it is too indefinite. Refresh his recollection if you want to.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, I don't know—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You can't ask whether he discussed it with Mr. James, Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson. What difference does it make?

Mr. Grossman: It depends on who Mr. James, Mr. Jones and Mr. Robinson are.

Presiding Inspector: You must ask him some identifying question. You don't want to ask whether he discussed it with his wife; the children, all that sort of thing; we would never end.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, it will take me twenty questions to cover the subject if—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) No, it won't because I won't allow twenty questions. Now, ask him some question so that we can make some progress.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever discuss this conversation before the [1206] FBI man spoke to you with any representative of the FBI, any other representative of the FBI?

A. I don't recall of ever—

Q. (Interposing) Did you ever discuss this before the FBI man talked to you with any other representative of the Government?

A. Not that I can recall.

Q. Did you ever discuss this conversation before the FBI man talked to you with any official of any union?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. Did you ever discuss this before the FBI man talked to you with any representative of the Police Department?

A. Not that I can recall.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. Go ahead. Soon he will have twenty questions.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever discuss this before the FBI man talked to you with Mr. Bonham of the Immigration and Naturalization Service?

1928

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amps Floyd Kelley.)

A. I don't recall it.

Q. Did you ever discuss this before the FBI man talked to you with any employee or representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service? [1207]

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I think it is getting close to the twenty questions.

Presiding Inspector: Well, that may be. Go ahead.

A. I don't recall.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever discuss this before the FBI man talked to you with any member of a union?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, he has already asked that, if your Honor please, and I object to it on the ground that it has been asked and answered.

Presiding Inspector: Well, do you expect a different answer?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead and answer it.

A. I don't recall any such discussions.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Between the time that you say you heard this conversation and the time that the FBI man talked to you did anything happen that refreshed your memory on this conversation?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, your Honor.

A. Yes, there was. Many things happened between the time—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I will al-

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

low it. It is to refresh anything that occurred to refresh his recollection, and he said, "Yes." [1208]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is the answer?

A. The day the convention retired in Seattle one of the Business Agents for one of the unions in California—I don't recall the town—had quite a long conversation with me in the lobby of the hotel in regards to "Kelley, you watch the newspaper in Portland and see what we do to that goon squad tomorrow when we go through." And that recalled to my attention the conversation that was carried on in room 305 between Bridges and myself.

Q. Anything else?

A. And I did notice in the paper where there were two or three of the goon squad put in the hospital after these boys had went through.

Q. And you associated Bridges with the goon squad, did you?

A. No sir, I did not.

Q. Then, how did this refresh your recollection?

A. Because of the conversation that was carried on between this other Business Agent and myself.

Q. What is the relationship between a goon squad and Bridges?

A. The activities of a goon squad and the activities of Communism has a little the same relationship in appearance. [1209]

Q. Well, did you associate Bridges with Communism as a result of that conversation you say you heard?

A. No, I recalled the conversation when this man brought up that subject.

1930

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. Now, let me get this straight. The conversation you have been relating, an impression might have been given to you from the conversations that you related that Bridges was associated with Communism, with the Communist Party, is that correct?

A. I didn't get that question.

Q. Did you get an impression—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Let the reporter read the question.

Presiding Inspector: Let the reporter read the question.

Mr. Grossman: Will you read it, please?

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to withdraw it?

Mr. Grossman: No.

Presiding Inspector: Read the question, then.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

The Witness: I still don't get the question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. All right. Did you get the impression from this conversation which involved Dietrich and Bridges, that Bridges was connected with the Communist Party?

A. You mean the conversation that was in the room [1210] between Bridges, myself and Dietrich?

Q. That is correct.

A. I did get that impression.

Q. All right. Then, if that conversation was recalled to you by this discussion on goon squad activi-

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

ties was it because you associated Bridges with goon squad activities?

Presiding Inspector: Did he say that, that it was recalled to him?

Mr. Grossman: He said the conversation on goon squad activities recalled this, or refreshed his recollection.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't so understand it. Did he use the word "recall"?

Mr. Grossman: Refreshed.

Presiding Inspector: You asked him whether there was anything that occurred between there that impressed his memory?

Mr. Grossman: Refreshed, I think was the word I used.

Presiding Inspector: Refreshed? Maybe you did.

Mr. Grossman: I am pretty sure I did.

Presiding Inspector: We will assume you did.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did it refresh your memory because you associated Bridges with the Communist Party and both with goon squads?

A. I couldn't say it refreshed my memory. It did impress, reminded me of the conversation, yes, when I heard this [1211] man make those comments.

Q. Now, what else can you remember about this conversation that took place in Dietrich's room?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that. He has already asked him that. The witness has given all of the conversation.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Presiding Inspector: I will allow if

Mr. Grossman: I don't believe I have asked him that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state anything else—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Well, you are entitled to ask if there is anything else.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state anything else that you can remember that transpired in that room when Dietrich and Bridges and you were present.

A. Yes, there was a conversation pertaining to revolvers.

Q. What was that conversation?

A. Dutch Dietrich showed me his .38 or—I think it was a .38—it was a little black bull dog—and asked me my opinion as to the best gun, his type or the type that Harry Bridges was supposed to have had, something along that line.

Q. You mean Dietrich said that Bridges was supposed to have had a certain type of gun? [1212]

A. In fact, if I recall the situation, Mr. Dietrich brought both guns to me like this, "Kelley, which do you think is the best gun?"

Q. Well, you say, "If I recall the situation." Do you recall that two guns were brought?

A. That is right; I am of the opinion that they were, yes.

Q. All right. Did Dietrich say one was his and one was Bridges'?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

A. He didn't say that one was his and one was Bridges. I stood right there and seen it, heard the conversation between him and Bridges, and all of the conversation—pertaining to everything they talked about.

Q. Well, what happened that caused you to associate one of those guns with Bridges?

A. Dietrich asked me which one I thought was the best gun.

Q. Well, who told you that one of those guns was associated with Bridges, if any one?

A. I seen him reach over to Bridges and pick it up?

Q. You mean Bridges was carrying one of those guns?

A. Bridges had one of those guns.

Q. What kind of a gun was Bridges carrying?

A. I don't recall the make or anything about it. It was a small revolver apparently about a .32.

[1213]

Q. What was the discussion about these guns?

A. What would be the discussion with any three men that had had a few drinks and one of them was trying to brag his gun up and the other one was trying to brag his gun up, and I was a neutral party sitting back observing what was going on?

Q. Is that all you can remember about the guns?

A. That is all.

Q. Do you recall anything else that transpired during that meeting, or at that time?

1934

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

A. No, I do not.

Q. Can you think of anything else that refreshed your recollection of that meeting between the time that it transpired and the time that the FBI man spoke to you first?

A. No, I do not.

Q. You cannot?

A. No.

Q. Do you know how the FBI heard that you might have some information on Bridges?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object.

A. They never informed me as to that.

Mr. Del Guercio: That has been gone over and over and over again.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. They may have told him.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your answer? [1214]

A. They never informed me, advised me how they were informed as to what I knew. I never asked.

Q. Did anyone advise you? A. No.

Q. Have you any idea, then, from any information you have as to how the FBI found out you had, or might have, some information on Bridges?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, why not ask—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I don't think that is very material.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, may I state this:

Presiding Inspector: Of course, it may have been from Dietrich; we don't know.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Mr. Grossman: Well, the significant thing is that Dietrich testified at the last hearing and didn't mention this incident. That is why—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) That isn't in evidence at all.

Presiding Inspector: We can't hear that. I will exclude that and order it be stricken out of the record. You must not repeat things of that kind.

Mr. Del Guercio: I ask that counsel be—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) Your Honor, that is the [1215] reason I am pressing this point.

Presiding Inspector: Well, we don't know anything about Dietrich. We don't know whether— he may not have said anything about it. What difference does that make?

Mr. Grossman: Well, your Honor—

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't make any difference so far as this case has gone now and I don't see how you can ask this present question, but if you want it, I will let you have it.

Mr. Grossman: Will you try to answer the question?

Presiding Inspector: Of course, you must remember that I have no knowledge of anything that occurred in this other proceeding.

Mr. Grossman: Well, your Honor, this much is true: I have a certain obligation to you to show the relevancy of the questions. That is why I mentioned this about Dietrich. Because of that, I think I am entitled to go further and more in—

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

tensively into this question of how the FBI found out about it.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think so, but I will let you have it. Go ahead. I am ruling against my judgment on this. Go ahead.

- By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you any idea, Mr. Kelley, as to how the FBI found out that you might have some information dealing with [1216] Mr. Bridges?

A. I have no idea how they—only my own conclusion.

Q. Well, I want to know whether you have any facts, or anything like that?

A. No, I have no facts.

Q. That gives you a basis for knowing—

A. (Interposing) No, I have no facts.

Q. What time of day was this incident you have been referring to in Dietrich's room?

A. I couldn't place an exact time but I believe it was shortly after 3:00 o'clock. I used to go to work at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

Q. You say shortly before or shortly after?

A. I said shortly after; you heard me.

Q. Had you had any drinks before this incident took place?

A. No, sir.

Q. Of your own knowledge how many drinks did Dietrich have?

A. I don't know. They were drinking before I went up.

Q. Do you know how long before you went up they were drinking?

A. No, I do not.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. How many drinks did you see Dietrich take?

A. I believe it was two while I was there, or three, not [1217] over three.

Q. When you say three, what do you mean, three ordinary drinks, ordinary size?

A. Right.

Q. He was not drinking with a wine bottle or anything like that? A. No.

Q. How many drinks did Bridges have, to your knowledge?

A. I believe I only seen him—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) That last remark of counsel, if your Honor please, ought to be stricken from the record.

Presiding Inspector: Well, let it stand. I think it is a good thing to have in the record. Go ahead.

The Witness: I believe Harry only had one that I recall.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What was the impression you got from that conversation, that Bridges and Dietrich were on very good terms? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it a jolly affair, if you understand what I mean by that expression?

A. He impressed me as being—they both impressed me as being very close friends. [1218]

Q. Were they acting in a jolly fashion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you get the impression that this statement of Dietrich was, however, a very serious statement or a joking, jolly statement?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

A. At the time I never even gave it a second thought because I had no occasion of take it serious and I paid no attention to it.

Q. Did you pay any more attention to the answer than you did to the question, or were they—you treated them both alike?

A. That is right.

Q. You paid no particular attention to either of them?

A. Other than in the hotel business you naturally observe everything that goes on.

Q. After this occasion did you ever have a telephone conversation with Harry Bridges?

A. Did I ever have a telephone conversation with Harry Bridges?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't recall any such conversation.

Q. Did you ever write a letter to Harry Bridges?

A. I am not positive. I think that I did at one time, I think.

Q. About what?

A. I don't recall. It was pertaining to business, I [1219] think.

Q. Did you ever have any trouble with unions after this occasion?

A. Who wouldn't if they employ people?

Q. Well, it may be usual for you but the question still is, did you have, Mr. Kelley? Will you please answer the question? Did you have any trouble with unions after this occasion?

A. What do you define as trouble?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. Strikes or threatened strikes?

A. Strikes or threatened strikes?

Q. Or picketing or threatened picketing?

A. I had about three or four—about a week ago I had a run-in with a Business Agent for the Cleaners Union.

Q. How long ago? A. About a week ago.

Q. Any other?

A. Any other run-ins?

Q. Any other trouble with unions as I have defined it?

A. Oh, I had several arguments, several times I had arguments with them where I felt they were stepping on my toes.

Q. Did you ever get in touch with Harry Bridges to help you out in your difficulties with unions?

A. Harry Bridges to help me out? [1220]

Q. Yes, that is right. Did you? A. No.

Q. What was the answer, please? A. No.

Q. You are sure of that? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why do you say you might have written to Harry Bridges? What would you have had to write Harry Bridges about?

A. Well, for instance, if I thought I could create business by writing to any individual it was a practice of mine to do so.

Q. Then, you would say if you wrote to Harry Bridges, or if you might have written to Harry Bridges it would have been on the question of his sending you or getting you business and on no other question?

1940

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, the witness says that is his best recollection.

Presiding Inspector: I know. I will take that into consideration. I will ~~allow this question.~~

Mr. Grossman: Would you read back the question, please, Miss Reporter?

Mr. Del Guercio: If you have the letter I suggest it be shown to the witness.

If your Honor please, that would be the most logical thing [1221] to do.

Presiding Inspector: This is cross examination. I will allow it. To your best recollection.

Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: His best recollection. You want his best recollection.

A. I do not recall of ever writing to him at this moment.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you recall anything arising that—withdraw that.

Did you ever have anything to do with trying to organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

A. Did I ever have any—

Q. Anything directly or indirectly to do with such a thing?

A. I was a—one of a group of small hotel operators who made an effort—we made some effort to transfer—to start, which I compelled my employees to join, a Local 6 union, to obtain them 25 members to obtain a charter.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. Local 6, CIO?

A. No, it was an A. F. of L., then after they had obtained a charter I attended an association meeting, a hotel association meeting in the Olympic Hotel whereby a foundation was laid to sign the hotels up with the union, and I stuck up for the [1222] union to the extent that they threatened to throw me out of the hotel association meeting because I stuck up for them. In later negotiations, the Business Agent of Local 6, who happened to have a record as—

Q. (Interposing) Do you consider this is an answer to my question about the CIO?

A. You are asking me, aren't you?

Q. Do you consider this an answer to my question as to whether you had anything to do in organizing the CIO Union?

A. Yes, I am giving you my answer.

Q. All right.

A. They signed the contract with the association compelling me to pay greater wages than a thousand-room hotel, which naturally created friction among all independent hotel operators. And at that time there was an effort to bring the union over CIO and the union itself was in favor of going CIO because of the strife they were having within themselves within their own ranks.

Q. What did you have to do with that?

A. What did I have to do with it?

Q. Yes. / You have given a picture of what happened but you haven't told what part you played.

1942

Harry Bridges vs:

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, that remark of counsel should be stricken as to what he thinks he has been told. This is for the Court, I understand, not for counsel's benefit. [1223]

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Or is it for his benefit?

Presiding Inspector: I don't quite understand the question.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, my question obviously didn't call for whether there was an A. F. of L. Union, whether it had any membership or not. I asked him whether he directly or indirectly had anything to do with organizing the CIO union. That is what I am repeating.

A. There was not a CIO union organized; there was not a CIO union organized.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you directly or indirectly do anything to try to organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that as already having been asked and answered.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know whether it has been answered. I will take it. He says there was no CIO union organized but he has left it open as to whether there was any attempt to organize.

The Witness: Yes, there was.

Presiding Inspector: Now, did you have anything to do with it?

The Witness: I attended meetings with other

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

hotel members and some fellow was organizer there that was going to act as [1224] organizer to switch them over, or something, to straighten them out.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Now, do you remember getting in touch with Harry Bridges to help you organize a CIO union among hotel employees? A. No.

Q. Would you say that you did not do so?

A. I would say I don't recall it if I did.

Q. Do you recall Harry Bridges refusing to help you organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment. Are you referring to writings? Wouldn't it be easier—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) I am not certain.

Presiding Inspector: You are not certain.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, they made the motion here a little while ago of going through all these things down here, trying, I don't know for what purpose—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) That doesn't impress anyone. We will let Mr. Grossman go ahead.

Mr. Grossman: I am not saying there may not be documents in writing on this subject, but obviously being compelled to cross examine without a chance to prepare, we can't have everything here that might—we can't have the entire files of Mr. Bridges here. [1225]

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

1944

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you have any conversations with Mr. Bridges respecting his aiding you to organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

A. I don't recall any conversation.

Q. Would you say that you did not either orally or in writing ask Harry Bridges to help you organize, or help anyone organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

A. I would say I don't recall any such effort.

Q. Would you state that you did not go up to the office of the CIO in Seattle and discuss this question of the CIO organizing hotel employees with Harry Bridges?

A. I don't recall any such discussion.

Q. Would you say—

A. (Interposing) In fact, Mr. Bridges was an A. F. of L. representative at that time, if you just remind yourself of it.

Q. At which time are we now?

A. May the second.

Q. Of what year? A. 1937.

Q. Is that the time that this question of CIO organization among hotel employees came up?

A. Approximately at that time; it was in the near vicinity, [1226] time, yes.

Q. I still want an answer to my question, Mr. Kelley, which is: Will you state that you did not discuss with Mr. Bridges at the CIO office in Seattle the question of helping you organize a CIO union among hotel employees?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

A. I answered that once, that I don't recall any such conversation or efforts.

Q. The second question was: Would you state that it did not take place?

Presiding Inspector: If you can recall?

A. I do not recall any such effort.

Presiding Inspector: Have you any recollection on the subject?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: Whether it did or didn't?

The Witness: No, I have no knowledge.

Presiding Inspector: You can't go further than that. He doesn't remember one way or the other.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you recall being informed in any way by Harry Bridges that he would not help you form a CIO union among hotel employees in Seattle?

A. Harry Bridges never informed me any such answers.

Q. Can you be more specific as to when this question [1227] was being discussed of the CIO union among hotel employees? You have stated it was about May, 1937. Can you be more specific?

A. No, I can't.

Q. Over how long a period did it extend?

A. I have no recollection of that myself.

Q. Can you state for how long a period you yourself were interested in the organization of hotel employees in the CIO union?

A. How long?

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

Q. For how long a period you personally were interested in—

A. (Interposing) I was interested in anything to keep from being forced out of business by a bunch of radicals, and at all times was in that position, and at all times was in favor of a thousand unions to split up and take the dictatorial policy away from any radical.

Q. When you say "a bunch of radicals" you mean the unions in Seattle that had jurisdiction over the employees of the hotels?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, he has not indicated any such thing. He means Communists, from what I gather.

Mr. Grossman: Are you testifying, Mr. Del Guercio, [1228] or is Mr. Kelley testifying?

Presiding Inspector: Neither of you are in order. Now, go ahead with the examination.

Mr. Grossman: I submit my question as proper, your Honor.

A. I mean this: In 1932 Jess Bradley ran for United States Senator on the Communist ticket in Bellingham, Washington. He declared himself with an affidavit he was a member of the Communist Party. He comes down to my hotel. He said, "Your maid can vac this room; she can't vac this one; she can vac this one; she can't vac the hall; she can do this; she can't do that." That is what I call dictatorial Communistic methods. [1229]

(Testimony of Amos Floyd Kelley.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. And what union did this gentleman represent? A. Local 6, A. F. of L.

Q. Was it Local 6 of the Building Service International? A. Yes.

Q. Of the A. F. of L.? A. Yes.

Q. Did you have a woman partner in May of 1937? A. A woman partner?

Q. Yes. A. My legitimate wife, is all.

Q. Was she your partner—in other words, did she participate with you in the ownership of this hotel?

A. She lived there in the hotel and we both worked together in operating it.

Q. Did she ever tell you that she had discussed with Harry Bridges the question of organizing the employees of the hotels into the CIO?

A. No. She never advised me of that. If she had I would have told her to keep her nose out of the hotel business.

Presiding Inspector: Don't volunteer.

Mr. Grossman: No more questions.

Mr. Del Guercio: No more questions.

If your Honor please, may we have a short recess?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. [1230]

Mr. Del Guercio: May the witness be excused?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: Has the last witness gone?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: He has gone?

Mr. Del Guercio: Do you want him back?

Presiding Inspector: Yes; for just a moment.

Mr. Del Guercio: We will see if we can get him.

(Whereupon, a search was made for the witness.)

Mr. Del Guercio: He is here, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Take the stand again, Mr. Kelley, please.

AMOS FLOYD KELLEY

recalled as a witness on behalf of the Government; having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Grossman, in view of your later examination about how the Government might have known of these matters, I am going to allow you to ask a broad question, which I thought was immaterial so far as it bore on what was then before me. So you may ask him if he recalls whether he ever discussed with anybody this matter. This is in view of what subsequently came out.

Mr. Grossman: I understand. [1231]

Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Kelley, between the time that this incident took place in Mr. Dietrich's room, and the

(Testimony of Ambros Floyd Kelley.)

time that you first spoke to an FBI man about it, did you discuss it with anyone at all?

A. No, I don't recall any discussion.

Mr. Grossman: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. Del Guercio: We will have another witness in just a moment.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Raise your right hand.

DAWN LOVELACE

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Presiding Inspector: Give your name to the reporter.

The Witness: Dawn Lovelace—D-a-w-n L-o-v-e-l-a-c-e.

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Where do you live, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. Portland, Oregon.

Q. Are you married? A. I am a widow.

Q. What was your husband's name? [1232]

A. Richard Lovelace—Rohy Lovelace. (He was known as Richard Lovelace.

Q. When did he die, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. He died March 13th.

1950

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. This year? A. Last March 13th.

Q. Do you have any occupation at the present time?

A. Yes. At the present time I am working as a writer on the Oregon Writers' Project.

Q. Is that a WPA Project? A. Yes, it is.

Q. Do you have any children?

A. I have one.

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, were you ever a member of the Communist Party? A. I was.

Q. When did you join the Communist Party?

A. In May 1935.

Q. May 1935? A. Yes.

Q. For how long a period did you remain in the Communist Party?

A. For about six months. I dropped out, I believe, it was in October 1935.

Q. What were you doing at the time you joined the Communist Party? [1233]

A. Mainly I was working as a volunteer unpaid reporter and editorial writer with the Voice of Action.

Q. The Voice of Action? A. Yes.

Q. Where was that?

A. It was published in Seattle.

Q. By whom were you employed?

A. Well, I was requested to take this assignment by Lowell Wakefield.

Q. Who is Lowell Wakefield?

A. He was at that time the editor in chief of the Voice of Action.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Was he also a member of the Communist Party? A. Yes, he was.

Q. At that time? A. Yes, he was.

Q. You knew that of your own knowledge?

A. Yes.

Q. Was your husband also a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. He was, and had been for some time prior to my joining.

Q. Do you know for how long a period of time your husband had been a member of the Communist Party?

A. He joined, I believe it was, in July of 1932.

Q. For how long a period did he remain in the Communist [1234] Party?

A. He left the Communist Party in January, 1939; either December 1938 or January 1939.

Q. Has your husband ever been in the armed forces of the United States?

A. Yes; prior to the World War and during the World War.

Q. Did he serve overseas? A. He did.

Q. Was he wounded?

A. He was, and on more than one occasion.

Q. You say you were employed as a reporter on the Voice of Action just prior to the time you joined the Communist Party?

A. It was quite simultaneous. When Mr. Wakefield asked me if I would take over the work as Chairman of the Portland Bureau of the Voice of Action, it was suggested then that I join the Party.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. And did you continue your connections with the Voice of Action after you joined the Communist Party? A. I did.

Q. During all the time that you remained a member of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. And did you learn, during that period of time, that is while you were a member of the Communist Party, as to who controlled the Voice of Action? [1235]

A. I did; in fact, I was well aware of it before I joined the Communist Party.

Q. Who does control it, or who did at that time?

A. The District Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. Who was on the District Committee of the Communist Party at that time?

A. Lowell Wakefield was one of the members, and Morris Rapport.

Q. Morris Rapport? A. Yes.

Q. During the time that you were a member of the Communist Party were you given any assignments by the District Committee of the Communist Party, or any other persons connected with the Communist Party?

A. I was, on frequent occasions. In fact, all of the material was approved or censored by the Communist Party. Of course, my orders came either directly from Mr. Lowell Wakefield, or from the Managing Editor, who was also a member of the Communist Party to my knowledge.

Q. Who was the Managing Editor?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. James Couer.

The Reporter: Spell it, please.

The Witness: I believe it is C-o-u-e-r. He wrote under the name of Garland Andrews.

By Mr. Del Guercio: [1236]

Q. Did you do any work for the International Labor Defense?

A. Considerably. I wrote publicity, did some organizing work. Much of this was previous to my assignment as Editor of the Portland Bureau of the Voice of Action.

Q. Where did you do this work for the ILD?

A. Mainly in Portland, Oregon. Some of my assignments carried me to Salem.

Q. And under whom did you work with the International Labor Defense?

A. Part of the time under the direction of Irvin Goodman.

Q. Was he a member of the Communist Party also?

A. I wouldn't know as to that. I am sure he wasn't a member at that time.

Q. You said part of the time you worked under Goodman's direction. Under whom did you work the other part of the time?

A. Well, there were various people in charge of the International Labor Defense activities in Portland. Violet Olsen was one, and Mary Todd, part of the time. There was nothing static about the work.

1954

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Did you contribute articles, news articles, to the Voice of Action?

A. I did, quite consistently.

Q. Have you contributed articles to any other magazines or papers?

A. So far as left wing, or Communist dominated papers are [1237] concerned, I have contributed news articles and feature articles to the Daily Worker, Sunday Worker, New Masses; and I have also contributed as a free lance writer to Forum Magazine, New Republic, Common Sense.

Q. Did you ever contribute any articles to the Western Worker?

A. Yes. I did. In fact, much of the copy that was for the Voice of Action was also written to the Western Worker.

Q. Who controlled the Western Worker at the time you wrote those articles?

A. It was the official Party Publication.

Q. By "Party" you mean what?

A. Communist Party.

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, where did you reside during the year 1935?

A. At 1515 Southwest Jefferson Street.

Q. And for how long a period were you residing at that address?

A. We had been living there for about two years. I believe it was October 1935 that we moved to another place.

Q. To go back a little, when you joined the Communist Party did you join under your true name?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Yes, I believe I did.

Q. Did you try to conceal your membership in the Communist Party? [1238]

A. No, sir, I never did.

Q. Did all of your friends, and every one you knew, know that you were a member of the Communist Party?

A. They did, those who were at all concerned about it, and were aware of it.

Q. Did your husband conceal his membership in the Communist Party?

A. No, he did not.

Q. All of his friends with whom he came in contact knew that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, sir. He had no reason, or made no attempt to conceal it.

Q. Were you living at 1515 Southwest Jefferson Street, Portland, Oregon, on or about August 16, 1935?

A. I was.

Q. Do you know of any particular event that occurred on or about that date at your apartment, or home?

A. It was—I wouldn't be quite sure that it was the night of August 16th, but it was during the week of August 16th, that one evening Mr. Bridges came to our apartment.

Q. You say "Mr. Bridges." Do you recognize him here in the court room?

A. I do.

Q. Who is he?

A. He is the gentleman (indicating) in the gray suit there.

1956

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May the record show the witness has identified [1239] the Alien?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, in a gray suit, sitting at the end of the table. Mr. Bridges doesn't question the identification, or his counsel.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Go on, Mrs. Lovelace, and relate what occurred?

A. It was an unanticipated visit. There was no invitation extended. Mr. Bridges was accompanied by Hugh Adams, a longshoreman whom I knew.

Q. What?

A. A longshoreman whom I knew—whom we knew, rather.

There were with him, I believe, two other gentlemen, as I recall it, and I remember very little about them except one of them, his name was Starr.

Q. Was your husband at home at that time?

A. He was.

Q. What happened when the Alien, here, appeared at your home?

A. Well, Mr. Hugh Adams made the introduction. I was rather surprised, and I believe made some comment about the inadvisability of Mr. Bridges being at our apartment.

Q. Just what comment did you make, and to whom did you make it?

A. I made it to Hugh Adams.

Q. What did you say?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Well, as I recall, Hugh Adams asked for Matt Meehan, [1240] said they were looking for Matt Meehan.

I raised the question as to why they would be looking for Matt Meehan at our apartment. It seemed very illogical.

Q. What did they say to that?

A. There was no response as I recall. It was casual conversation.

I then rebuked Hugh Adams for suggesting or for having Mr. Bridges come to our apartment.

Q. Why did you rebuke him?

A. Because I felt that it placed Mr. Bridges, his reputation, in jeopardy because our reputation as Communists was rather open.

Q. You rebuked him because you didn't want it known that Bridges was associating with Communists?

A. Yes. I felt at that time it was unwise.

Q. Why did you think it was unwise?

Mr. Gladstein: That is calling for a conclusion.

Mr. Del Guercio: It was her state of mind at the time. It is part of the res gestate. She said she made a remark and rebuked him for bringing Harry Bridges there because he was known as a Communist.

Presiding Inspector: Let's exhaust her recollection first as to what was said.

Was anything said along that line as to why you thought it unwise, or why you rebuked him?

The Witness: I may have made some explana-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

tion; I don't [1241] recall. I think such things were rather understood.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What did you have in mind when you made that remark?

Mr. Gladstein: I renew the same objection.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is of doubtful materiality.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will withdraw the question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was any reply made to your remark?

A. I don't recall that there was.

Q. What happened thereafter? Did they remain in your apartment?

A. Yes. They came into the apartment and we sat down. I believe Harry Bridges sat down on a chair. I believe the other two gentlemen sat on a couch or davenport.

Q. And your husband was there also?

A. Yes; my husband was there.

Q. Did your husband go out at any time?

A. He did later in the evening to learn if James Murphy was home.

Q. If James Murphy was home?

A. Yes. We were living in an apartment house. James Murphy lived on the top floor of the apartment house. We lived on the first floor.

Q. Well, who is James Murphy?

A. James Murphy at that time was the Section Organizer [1242] of the Communist Party.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. And who asked your husband to see if James Murphy was home?

A. I don't recall just how that question arose, except that it was agreeable that my husband should ask for James Murphy.

Q. But in any event, the Alien here was present during that time?

A. Yes, he was, and he was perfectly agreeable to—

Q. (Interposing): To having your husband go out and find Mr. Murphy?

A. Yes; yes, sir.

Q. Did anything else happen at that time?

A. Well, when Mr. Bridges came to the apartment I had been working, as I recall it, either writing some releases for the Voice of Action, or drawing resolutions, or something. I have forgotten just what it was; I was working with a great deal of—I had been involved in a great deal of activity during that week. That was during the Oregon State Federation of Labor convention, and a part of my assignment was to cover the State Federation of Labor Convention for the Voice of Action. Another part of my work was to assist delegates, Party contact delegates in the State Federation of Labor Convention in drawing resolutions on issues which—

Q. (Interposing): You mean Communist Party delegates? [1243]

A. Some of them, I believe, were members of

1960

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

the Communist Party, although I have no definite way of knowing.

Q. Yes. And did you have any further conversation with Mr. Bridges there at your home?

A. Yes. Hugh Adams had a copy of their resolution which had been submitted in the State Federation of Labor Convention dealing with the farmer—the question of a farmer-labor policy, a third party movement, as they were dissatisfied with this particular resolution and wanted another resolution drawn, and that was one of the things that were discussed in the course of the evening.

I wrote a resolution to be submitted to the State Federation of Labor Convention endorsing the farmer-labor party.

Q. Did Mr. Bridges ask you to do anything for him?

A. Yes, Mr. Bridges made some comment about the typewriter. He said that he had some notes, some material that he wanted typed. He took a sheaf of notes from his pocket and for a considerable period of time dictated from these notes. As I recall, the notes had to do with a conference, a Maritime Conference in Washington, D. C.

Q. Did he say that he had just returned from such a conference?

A. Yes, he spoke quite a bit about the conference and the experiences in the conference, and the notes from which he [1244] dictated had to do with that.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Did your husband come back from James Murphy after he went out to look for him?

A. He returned from James Murphy's apartment very shortly and said that James was not in and, I believe, he left word for him to—for James Murphy to come to our apartment when he returned.

Q. And did James Murphy come to your apartment at any time during the time that Bridges was there?

A. Yes, I believe it was around midnight. I think Esther Murphy, James Murphy's wife, rapped on the door first to see what was wanted. She left and then James Murphy came down.

Q. And what occurred after James Murphy came to your apartment?

A. Well, it was quite apparent that James Murphy and Harry Bridges were acquainted, no introductions were necessary. They greeted each other and we then sat down and Harry—Harry Bridges had mentioned earlier in the evening that he had a question bothering him. He had to send a telegram, I believe, to San Francisco, outlining some—a course of action relative to some longshoremen ILA procedure, and earlier in the evening he had expressed, well, the desire, the wish to confer with somebody about the content of the telegram, what advice or direction he should give in the wire. [1245]

Q. Is that why he asked for James Murphy?

A. Well, that was the reason given for asking for Matt Meehan, and James Murphy seemed to be

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

an agreeable substitute for Matt Meehan. That, at least, was the apparent content of the conversation. And Bridges and James Murphy and my husband discussed the course of action to be advised in this telegram.

Q. By "this course of action" you mean that the Alien here had come to your apartment not knowing what instructions you wanted to send to this representative down here in San Francisco and so was discussing the matter over with your husband and with James Murphy?

A. I believe that to be true.

Q. And were you in on all of the discussions that went on about that matter?

A. I was present; much of that time. I was busy typing this material.

Q. Well, did they come to any conclusion?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. What happened when they did?

A. As they left Harry Bridges remarked that, well, he would send the wire.

Q. Did he ask you to send the wire?

A. No, he did not.

Q. Now, by that time had you finished with what he had dictated to you? [1246]

A. Yes, I had.

Q. And what did you do? How many copies of Bridges' dictation did you make?

A. I don't recall exactly. He asked that an original and two or three carbons be made and I

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

asked him if I might have, for my use, one carbon of the material.

Q. What did Mr. Bridges say when you asked him about that?

A. It was perfectly—it was agreeable to him; he didn't object.

Q. And did you keep a copy of the notes?

A. I did, for some time.

Q. And then what happened to them?

A. Well, oh, two or three months later I know in the course of this period I had written an article for *The Nation* dealing with the maritime situation on the West Coast. It was—the article was purchased and accepted but not published, incidentally, and I don't recall just how long afterwards it was, I had this material, this document or copy in an envelope with some other material. In the meantime my interest had—well, I had become rather indifferent to the whole matter. And a young man came to the apartment—I don't even recall whether we were living in that apartment or whether we had moved to a different apartment, but I think we were still in the same one—and this young man without—oh, he introduced himself casually, but I didn't [1247] pay enough attention to get his name, said that he wanted that material, that the San Francisco longshoremen wanted it. He said they had told him at the Workers Book Shop—that was pretty much a Communist Party headquarters—how to locate me, and

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

he said that they wanted the material, and I was indifferent to it and so I turned it over to him.

Q. Do you know or did Mr. Bridges tell you to whom he was going to send that wire in San Francisco?

A. Well, Mr. Bridges told me directly very little.

Q. Did you hear him say to whom he was going to send that wire?

A. I believe it was to Henry Schmidt, but as I say, it is a belief.

Q. Now, you spoke about preparing some resolution to be proposed at the convention for the farmer-labor party.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the Alien here participate in the discussions on the preparation of that resolution?

A. Yes, he participated in the discussion, made suggestions as to content and phrasing, very helpful suggestions.

Q. Do you know Matt Meehan, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. I do.

Q. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, I can't say that I do, I believe that he is [1248] either—he has either been a member or has been very close to the Communist Party but I have no definite knowledge of his party membership.

Q. Hugh Adams, the person that accompanied Bridges at the time that he appeared at your apartment, did you know him before?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Yes, I had known Hugh Adams for some weeks.

Q. Was he a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. You knew that?

A. I had never seen him in a Party meeting.

Q. But you knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you know Ted Starr, you say the other person that might have been there?

A. I had never seen him before and I have never seen him since.

Q. Now, Mrs. Lovelace, did any agents of the Government contact your husband during his lifetime in your presence?

A. Two agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation visited us in our home in my presence.

Q. And do you know, or were you present—strike that, please. [1249]

Do you know if your husband made a statement to the FBI Agents?

A. He did.

Q. Do you know if he signed that statement?

A. He did. I was present when he signed it.

Q. And did you read that statement that your husband had made?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. In your husband's presence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you saw him sign it?

A. Yes.

(Mr. Del Guercio handed document to counsel.)

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. One question, please, Mrs. Lovelace. You testified that—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Now, counsel are giving attention to the statement.

Mr. Del Guercio: Would you mind listening to this, please, first?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing): —that the Alien here, Mr. Bridges, was discussing with Mr. Murphy and your husband as to what instructions he should include in this telegram that he was [1250] to send to Henry Schmidt. Was your husband a member of the Maritime Union? A. He was not.

Q. Did he have any connection with it at all?

A. No.

Q. Was Mr. Murphy connected with the Maritime Union? A. No.

Q. Did he have any connection with it at all?

A. None whatsoever, except he was a section organizer of the Communist Party.

Q. Was he a union man?

A. He had previously belonged to one of the Red trade unions but he was not at that time.

Q. A member of any union? A. No.

Q. CIO or A. F. of L. or otherwise?

A. No.

Q. Or an independent union?

A. None whatsoever.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. And your husband was not a member of any union? A. No.

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you through with it, counsel?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, I show you an eleven-page statement [1251] dated Portland, Oregon, September 12, 1940, signed by R. L. Lovelace, witnessed by J. W. Coulter, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, and J. A. Robey, R-o-b-e-y, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, and "Witness" R. L. Lovelace, and ask you if that is the statement you saw your husband sign and that you read before he signed it? A. (Examining document.)

Mr. Gladstein: Is the question whether she saw it signed, Mr. Del Guercio?. Is that the question?

Presiding Inspector: No, he implies that; he assumes that in the question.

Mr. Gladstein: He is asking her now whether this is the document?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, it is a question for identification.

Mr. Gladstein: I see.

The Witness: That is the statement.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That is the statement? A. Yes, sir.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Is that your signature on the bottom of page eleven under "Witness?"

A. (Examining document): No; that is my husband's. [1252]

Q. I am only asking for information; I don't know. Is that your husband's signature?

A. That is my husband's signature?

Q. Do you recognize your husband's signature here also following the word "Signed"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And does your husband's signature appear on each sheet of this paper?

A. (Examining document): It does.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer it in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Mrs. King: I object, if your Honor please, on a number of grounds. In the first place the statement is not sworn to; it is merely a signed statement. In the second place, and most importantly, if this statement is introduced in evidence there is no opportunity given for the cross examination of the man who made it, and in the case of Gonzales against Zurbrick, 45 Fed. 2nd 934 which is a case from the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit, the Court there stated, citing authorities "The right to cross examine even in deportation proceedings is a constitutional one."

It seems to me for this reason the fact that this is mere hearsay, that it is not a sworn statement, that we would be seriously handicapped if we were

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

not given an opportunity [1253] to cross examine the maker of this statement which is now unfortunately impossible. This statement should not be admitted in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: Let's have a little more information as to how this statement was taken. This witness seems to have been present and to know all about it.

Mr. Del Guercio: She testified, I believe, your Honor, to——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Well, I mean in a little more detail.

Mr. Del Guercio: (Continuing) ——the making of the statement.

Presiding Inspector: I will ask the questions.

Mr. Del Guercio: Very well.

Presiding Inspector: Were you present when there was this interview between your husband and the FBI Agents?

The Witness: No, I was not present at the time the interview was had. I believe the discussion extended over a period of two or three days.

Presiding Inspector: Was this statement then brought back to your house in a typewritten form?

The Witness: It was.

Presiding Inspector: And what happened, then, after it was brought back?

The Witness: My husband took this statement and read [1254] it carefully and showed it to me. I read it enough to be sure of the contents and he

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

then, in my presence, signed the statement and signed each page of it.

Presiding Inspector: Is the content of the statement known to you now?

The Witness: It is.

Presiding Inspector: And do you know of the factual background, that is, do you know whether it is true, what is in the statement, of your own knowledge?

The Witness: I do.

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, I may say, if the Court please, that in the rules you are familiar with, where the witness is not available an ex parte statement is admissible.

Presiding Inspector: I know.

Mr. Del Guercio: In deportation proceedings.

Presiding Inspector: You may examine the witness about this statement, cross examine before it is introduced, if you wish to, or would you prefer to stand on your objection?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, one moment, your Honor.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Gladstein: Could we ask this, your Honor: If this statement is admitted in evidence is it admitted as testimony of Mr. Lovelace or testimony of Mrs. Lovelace?

Presiding Inspector: Well, of course. I have thought of [1255] that, and as the statement goes in, if it does go in, I suppose it is taken as the statement of Mr. Lovelace.

(Testimony of Dawy Lovelace.)

Mr. Gladstein: Therefore, it would be his testimony.

Presiding Inspector: What?

Mr. Gladstein: Therefore, it would be his testimony, would it not?

Presiding Inspector: It would be a statement. You could call it that if you wish to. Of course, the man is deceased.

Mr. Gladstein: I understand that.

Presiding Inspector: And it doesn't gain any importance on that ground, but it is impossible to call the witness. I say, the fact of his death doesn't make it any more important, but it does somewhat affect the admissibility in a proceeding of this kind and while, of course, cross examination is the rule there are certain exceptions to that and I am inclined to admit this statement as a statement of this man who signed it.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, if it is to be admitted as his statement, or as his testimony, there would be no point in our cross examining Mrs. Lovelace concerning that statement since it is not going in as her statement.

Presiding Inspector: Well, there might be; I don't know; I will give you that privilege. [1256]

Mr. Gladstein: In any event, we would prefer not to do that now if the admission of the document is on the ground you stated.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive the statement at this time and I will allow you subsequently

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

to move to strike it out and present brief on the matter.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

Presiding Inspector: But for the time being I will receive it.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 216.) [1257]

Presiding Inspector: Will you read it?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will read it, if your Honor please.

This is dated "Portland, Oregon, September 12, 1940.

"I, Richard Laverne Lovelace, wish to make the following voluntary statement to J. A. Robey, and J. W. Coulter whom I know to be Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice. I was born at Elkhead, Oregon October 10, 1898 and attended school in Douglas County, Oregon and later highschool at Grangeville, Idaho where I graduated in 1916.

"I joined the National Guard in 1915. I was discharged from the active list in January 1917 and was inducted into active service on April 6, 1917 of the Idaho National Guard. The Idaho National Guard became the 116th Engineers of the 41st Division and I went to France with the armed forces in October of 1917. After landing at France, I was transferred to Company C, 2nd Engineers, a regular army organization and remained in France for the duration of the war, returning to this coun-

(Testimony of Dawn Loyelace.)

try in June 1919 where I was discharged July 6, 1919 at Fort DA Russell, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

"While in the armed forces in France, I was wounded and hospitalized October 5, 1918, Base 1, Vichy, France.

"I presently reside at 1515 S. W. Jefferson Street, Portland, Oregon with my wife Dawn and daughter Romaine who is 2½ years old. [1258]

"After my return from France, I was hospitalized on several occasions in the Veterans Administration Facility and held various employment up to June 1932 at which time I joined the Portland Section of the Communist Party, remaining a member in good standing until January 1939.

"During my membership in the Communist Party I was assigned to various activities in Oregon and at Washington, D. C. When I first became a member of the party in Portland, I was assigned the task of organizing a Portland Post of the Workers Ex-Service men's League, a Veterans Front Organization which had been organized at New York in 1930 under the direction and control of the Communist Party. I subsequently participated in defense activities on behalf of the party through the International Labor Defense. In April 1933 at the direction of the Section Bureau of the Portland Section of the Communist Party, I organized a United Front Conference of all Veterans Organizations which was held during the same month in the labor temple auditorium at Portland, Oregon. The purpose of this conference as stated in the call was

1974

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

to oppose the Economy Act which had recently been enacted. In addition to the stated purpose of the call, the question of payment of bonus and relief for all unemployed was raised and accepted by the conference. The conference also voted to support a Rank and File Convention which had been called for [1259] May, 1933 at Washington, D. C. by the Veterans National Liaison Committee, a committee composed of 5 members, two of whom were members of the New York District of the Communist Party.

"A member of the Communist Party, Portland, was sent to this aforementioned conference to give greetings in the name of the Portland Section of the Communist Party. I was delegated by the conference to organize a delegation of Rank and File Veterans to proceed to Washington, D. C. to participate in the convention which had been called there for May. Late in April, I left Portland with approximately 100 Veterans and proceeded to Washington, D. C. Stop overs were made at Spokane, Bismarck, N. D., Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Chicago, Illinois. At all stop overs, the Contingent was quartered and maintained their headquarters in halls either maintained by, or under the control of the Communist Party. In each of the cities mentioned, I contacted the leading officials of the Communist Party for the purpose of securing this support in raising finances, securing food, etc. for the furtherance of the trip to Washington. The Contingents arrived in Washington early in May.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

and subsequently participated in the Rank and File Convention which maintained headquarters at Fort Hunt, Virginia.

"On my arrival in Washington, I reported to the Veterans National Liaison Committee at the Maryland Building, 14th and H Streets, Washington, D. C. The Maryland Building headquarters [1260] were in charge of George Brady, Edward Williams; Al Sellers, Harold Hickerson, and Emanuel Levin, the last two named being members of the Communist Party. Approximately 3,000 veterans were quartered in tents at Fort Hunt, Virginia, all tents and equipment being provided by the U. S. Government at the direction of the President of the United States.

"When the forces were organized to run the camp at Fort Hunt, I was made chairman of the camp executive committee. In the meantime Israel Amter and James Ford, members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party U.S.A. had arrived in Washington and at their direction I was attempting to make contact with all the Communist Party members quartered at Fort Hunt. I subsequently contacted approximately 30 members and organized them into what was known as a camp fraction. Later, at the direction of Amter I brought several of these members into Washington and held a conference lasting one entire evening where the policies of the party relative to the Rank and File Convention were discussed. It was stressed at this conference it was necessary for us to raise the level

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

of our anti war activity, in the convention. Later, at the direct command of Mater I placed a resolution against war to the convention which was rejected by that body in its closing session. Also in the closing session I was elected to a National Committee to carry on the work of the convention and subsequently at a general meeting of this National Committee [1261] was elected to an Executive Committee, and at a later meeting the Executive Committee, was elected to a resident committee to remain in Washington, D. C. during the coming year, and at the first meeting of the resident committee was elected Treasurer. I remained in Washington D. C. until early in November 1933 at which time I was relieved of further duties on my own committee at my own request due to the illness of my wife and myself.

"During my stay in Washington, I not only participated in the activities of the Committee of which I was a member, but participated in the activity of the local section of the Communist Party and also served as a member of the National Arrangements Committee in organizing the first American Congress against war and Fascism which was held in New York in the autumn of 1933. Shortly after the end of the convention I received a letter from the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in New York enclosing a money order which directed me to come to New York immediately. On my arrival in New York I contacted Emanuel Levin and after a night spent pre-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

paring a detailed analysis of the Rank and File Convention on the following day appeared with Levin before the political bureau of the central committee of the Communist Party. The people present at this political bureau meeting were Robert Miner, Ella Reeves Bloor, Israel Amter, James Ford, Jack Stachel, Alex Bittelman, and Max Bedacht, also someone who was introduced only under the name of Brown whom I understand to be the representative of the Communist International.

"After making our report which occupied approximately two hours, and which was accepted by the political bureau, I was ordered to return to Washington, D. C. to resume my duties with the Veterans Rank and File Committee. After my return to Portland in November of 1933 I became active through the Veterans Rank and File group in the unemployed organizations, and at the direction of the Section Committee of the Communist Party, worked to bring about a Federation of all the various unemployed groups in Multnomah County.

"Sometime in December, a convention was held composed of delegates of all the unemployed groups located in Multnomah County, at which time the Multnomah County Federation of unemployed was formed. I presided as Chairman of the convention and was elected with two other party members—Dirk DeJong and William Webber to the Executive Committee of the Unemployed Federation. I also was elected Vice President at the same convention.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

I continued my work with the Multnomah County Federation of the Unemployed until the summer of 1934, always working in collaboration and under the direction of the Section Bureau of the Portland Section of the Communist Party. The Party fraction on the executive committee composed of De Jong, Webber and myself, met frequently to formulate the policies for the executive committee. From time to time general [1263] fraction meetings were held at which all members of the Communist Party who were members of the Federation were present. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the policies of the Communist Party toward the unemployed Federation and to organize the necessary tactical maneuvers to bring these policies in force. In the early summer of 1934 at the instruction of the Section Bureau of the Portland Section of the Communist Party, I resigned from my place in the unemployed Federation in order to assume the task of building a local branch of the American League against war and Fascism. After approximately 2 months organizational work, sometime in August 1934 a convention was held in the Pythian Temple at Portland, Oregon composed of delegates from Trade Unions, Unemployed Organizations, Civic bodies, and the Communist Party. I prepared and presented the Manifesto which opened the convention.

"One of the high lights of this convention was the occurrence of the soldier in Uniform in the 7th Infantry, Vancouver Barracks, who appeared on

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

the platform and made a speech in favor of establishing a branch of the American League against war and fascism and stressed the need of more intensive work among the armed forces in the fight against war and fascism. At the closing session, a branch of the American League against War and Fascism was established in Portland and I became a member of its executive committee. [1264]

"One other Communist and several close sympathizers of the party were elected to the executive committee. At the same time, the American League against War and Fascism played an active roll in supporting the waterfront strike which had broken out during the summer of 1934. Various arrests were made among Communist Party members on charge of criminal syndicalism. The American League members packed the court room at the preliminary hearing in the demonstration of the support of the defendants.

"I continued my activity with the American League until the Spring of 1935 at which time, at the direction of the Section Bureau of the Communist Party I returned to work among Veterans.

"At the May convention of the Portland Section of the Communist Party, I was elected to the Section Committee of the Communist Party, and subsequently was elected by the Section Committee to the Section Bureau. I continued my activity in the Rank and File Veterans Organization and assisted through this Veterans Organization, which was an affiliate of the Oregon Workers Alliance,

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

an organization of unemployed, in building a national wide demonstration against the proposed schedule of hours and wage payments proposed on WPA. This demonstration was held Plaza Park, Portland, August 17, and was followed by a parade through the Streets of Portland. Approximately 10,000 people participated [1265] in the demonstration. This demonstration was a part of nation wide demonstration held on that same day by the Workers Alliance. In all instances the Communist Party participated in formulating the plans for the demonstrations, supplied the ideas and slogans, and did everything possible to make them a success.

"I continued my work in the Workers Alliance through the Veterans Grouping during 1935 but following out the policies of the United Front against War and Fascism as outlined by the 7th World Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow, Russia 1935. I began the disintegration of the Veterans Grouping by persuading the members they should join either the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars or Disabled American Veterans of the World War to do work inside those organizations.

"On November 15, 1935 I was employed as a Senior Research Assistant by the Federal Writers Project, Works Projects Administration. My classification was subsequently changed to that of Senior writer and I was entrusted by the Section Committee of the Communist Party with a task of organizing a local of the American Federation

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

of Government Employees on the Federal Cultural Projects and white collar projects of the WPA.

"At the Spring convention 1936 of the Portland Section of the Communist Party I was elected to the Executive Committee and in turn elected to the Section Bureau of the Party. At the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in the summer of 1936 I was [1266] instructed to secure all the support possible from the people employed on my project and other projects with which I had contact in the matter of financial donations and in support of the Spanish Loyalists and Recruits to go to Spain. In October of 1936 we were successful in forming a local of the American Federation of Government Employees. Acting under the instructions of the Communist Party, this local immediately became a recruiting ground and a source of financial support for the Spanish Loyalists. I continued my activity along with the other Communists who were members of the American Federation of Government Employees Local in supporting the committee for industrial organization and opposing their expulsion from the American Federation of Labor until the Spring of 1937 at which time we were refused a permanent charter by the Grand Lodge of the United Federation of Government Employees. The central task which occupied the attention of the union in the Spring and summer of 1936 was the removal of the State Director of the Writers and Historical Records Survey Project—Alfred Powers. The Union at this

1982

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

time had grown to a membership of approximately 200.

"After being refused the charter by the Grand Lodge of the American Federation of Government Employees on the instructions of the Section Bureau of the Communist Party, the Communist Fraction in the Executive Committee proposed that the organization affiliate the Oregon Workers Alliance. The first effort toward affiliation of membership was rejected and the union [1267] functioned as an independent organization for about 4 months during which period an intensive educational campaign was carried on in behalf of the Workers Alliance. At the end of approximately 4 months period a referendum on affiliation of the Workers Alliance was accepted by a large majority of the membership.

"In July 1937 I was dropped from the Writers Project under quota reduction and approximately two weeks later was returned to work as Senior Research Assistant on the survey of Federal Archives, where I continued my employment until March 1, 1939 at which time I resigned to enter the Veterans Bureau Hospital for a heart complication.

"During 1938 when the Communist Party naturally and logically was intensifying its support for the Spanish Loyalist, I began to have increasing difficulties relative to my ideas and disagreements with the policies of the Communist Party. To all intents and purposes, the party was at-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

tempting to use the Union of which I was a member solely as a recruiting ground and as a fund raising organization for what was termed the Spanish Loyalist Cause and this was leading to disintegration of the union. I opposed this policy and was severely censured on various occasions. Due to the development in the International situation and the policy of the party shifting, to all intents and purposes, it became in the main an instrument for carrying out the policy of the foreign office of the Soviet [1268] Union. I discontinued paying dues and attending membership meetings of the party in November 1938. In January 1939 I received notice by mail that charges had been preferred against me before the control commission of the Multnomah County Section of the Communist Party and that I was to appear to answer these charges. Subsequently, sometime in January, I was notified of my expulsion from the party and some thirty days later, which is the period allowed for appeal to the district committee of the Communist Party, and which appeal I failed to make, I was notified of my final expulsion.

"During my approximate 7 years which I spent in the Communist Party, USA, all literature, all speeches of party functionaries, and all discussions at party conventions conclusively prove that the Communist Party of the U.S. is a subsidiary of the Communist International with headquarters at Moscow USSR. The Communist International, without question, in the final analysis, is the gov-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

erning body of all of the various National Sections of the Communist Party. The American Party has been affiliated to the Communist International since its organization in 1919. One or more representatives of the Communist International have constantly been maintained in the United States at the expense of the Communist International. These representatives are entrusted with the task of advising the Central Committee of the Communist Party, USA relative to such political policies as that body may formulate. This [1269] representative is also empowered to modify and change such policies as he might believe were not in accord with the current policies of the Communist International. The Communist Party of the USA designates as its highest body the National Convention which in past years was held at infrequent intervals, but which of late years has met annually, usually in New York City. Between Conventions, the National Committee which is elected at each National Convention, is designated as the highest body of the Party. However, to all effects and purposes, the political Bureau which is elected by the National Committee and all of whose members reside in New York, carry on and direct all of the political policies of the party. In addition to this Political Bureau, from the members of the Central Committee, there is elected a control commission which also reside in New York and passes on matters pertaining to party discipline. The Communist Party of the USA has been sub-divided

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

into districts. These districts may comprise one State or more. At the head of each district there is a district committee composed of party members who have attended the yearly district convention as delegates, and who are elected by the delegates at the district convention. The district committee in turn elects a district bureau, which is usually composed of members residing at or near district headquarters. The district committee also elects district organizers. However, this district organizer must be acceptable to [1270] the National Committee, or briefly, to the political bureau of the central committee and in turn of course to the representative of the Communist International.

"The district is again subdivided into States. At the head of each State Committee would be a chairman, an executive Secretary who had been elected at a State Convention composed of various delegates from the county sections located within that State. However, again, a chairman or executive Secretary could only be elected who had been approved by the District Organizer. Next is what is termed the Basic Organization of the party which is the Unit or Branch. The Unit or Branch is composed of party members working in a particular shop, factory, industry, or located in a particular section of a city, town or country side. At the head of each Branch or Unit would be a chairman, secretary and organizer. These officers of the Branch or Unit could only be elected if

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

they had been approved of in advance by the county executive committee or county committee.

"Many times Branches or Units are divided into smaller groups known as squads or cells. The purpose of the squad or cell would be the grouping together of all party members who are working together in a particular shop, factory, Union, or unemployed organization. The party also has an organizational form composed of fractions. The fraction is in many instances a duplication of the squad or cell. In other words, a fraction is composed of all the members located in any one particular [1271] union, mass organization, etc. The fractions do not formulate policies. Fraction Secretaries receive instructions relating to all matters of political policy from the Secretary or County Executive Committee. The fraction Secretary in turn passes these instructions on to the members of the fraction and the tactical and organizational work of the fractions is outlined accordingly.

A top fraction meeting would be a meeting comprised of all of the fraction secretaries of the various fractions located in any particular industry or engaged in any particular strike or other form of struggle.

"From time to time world congresses representing all the National Secretaries of the Communist Party have been held in Moscow USSR. This Congress is composed of delegates elected from all of the various sections of the Communist Inter-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

national. The number of delegates each National Section may have is predicated on the paid up membership of that section."

Presiding Inspector: I think we will stop here. We will recess until two o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 P.M., a recess was taken until 2:00 P.M. of the same day.) [1272]

After Recess

2:00 o'clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

DAWN LOVELACE

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Direct Examination (Resumed)

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Del Guercio, I believe you were reading a document. Proceed.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will continue the reading. I believe I left off on page 8.

"It is my understanding, and I am sure the understanding of every Communist Party member who attended conventions, listened to speeches by the various leading functionaries of the party, and read the literature of the party, that the principal aim and object of the Communist Party, USA is the overthrow of the Capitalistic system and the

(Testimony of Dawn Loyelace.)

establishment of what is termed Dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of building what is termed Socialism in the United States of America. While the Communist Party of the USA does not openly state this as a purpose on all occasions or is not ostensibly engaged in this particular task at all times this is the stated reason for building mass Communist Party for fighting for better conditions such as shorter hours, higher wages, more relief to the unemployed, and all of the other demands raised in the various strug- [1273] gles organized by or under the leadership of the Communist Party. These demands are what are termed temporary demands or aims, and they are brought forward solely for the purpose of increasing the membership of the Communist Party and establishing the Communist Party as the leader of the working class and its allies. The contention of the Communist Party, USA, and the Communist International as well, is that in all capitalistic societies there is a class struggle constantly widening in scope and that the historical role of all sections of the Communist Party is to revolve that class struggle by the over throw of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. I have never heard it contended in any literature or by any speaker of the Communist Party that this could be accomplished by any other means than by force and violence. While the Communist Party does not hesitate to use the ballot in order to get before the electorate of the country in order to bring for-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

ward its program and its temporary demands, this is regarded as only a make-shift at the best, and further is only another means of building the influence and membership of the Communist Party.

"The Communist Party is prepared whenever necessary to use either legal or illegal means to gain its ends. In the event a member of the Communist party is required to make a statement under oath in court or otherwise, whether in his own defense or in defense of some other member of the Communist Party, he is instructed that he is to pay no attention to requirements of the [1274] oath and make such statements as will best further the interests of the Communist Party.

"The Communist Party, USA, does not believe that revolution in the United States is imminent. It feels that the United States is a stronghold of world capitalism and has a good deal of ability to survive for a long period of time. It does believe, however, with the continual sharpening of contradictions within the capital structure of the country, that in the event of war over a long period of time, that if the Communist Party has placed itself securely in the leadership of, and in dominance over, the main strata of workers and particularly those in heavy industries, and also has made a considerable penetration into the armed forces of the country, that it would be possible due to the disillusionment of people at war to bring about the early overthrow of the American System of Government.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

"The main or 'concentration points of the Communists in 'securing membership' is first in what is termed the heavy industries, particularly that of transportation and in this particular period, also the various armed forces, such as the regular army, Navy, National Guard, Citizens' Military Training Camps, etc.

"To the best of my recollection, I was first introduced to Harry Bridges near the corner of 3rd and Alder Streets in Portland, Oregon by Harry L. Gross, Attorney at Law, now deceased. Fur- [1275] ther, to the best of my recollection, this introduction took place some time in the Autumn of 1934.

"Although in the following months I had occasion to read about Harry Bridges in the Press many times, to hear about him many times through party channels, I had no further direct contact with him until August 16, 1935 at which time he came to my apartment at 1515 S. W. Jefferson Street in Portland, Oregon in the company of Hugh Adams, member of the Waterfront Unit of the Portland Section of the Communist Party. Two other people were with Bridges and Adams, both, according to my understanding, members of the Maritime Federation in San Francisco. One was introduced to me under the name of Starr.

The other's name I have forgotten.

"Bridges at this time had just returned by airplane from Washington, DC where he had appeared as a witness before the Maritime Commis-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

sion hearing, and was enroute to his home in San Francisco. The announced purpose of the call of Bridges and Adams to my apartment was that they were seeking James A. Murphy, then Section Organizer, Portland Section of the Communist Party. Murphy was a resident of the same apartment house where I lived. They had been unable to locate Murphy due to the fact he was away from home at the time of their call. They remained during the remainder of the evening in my apartment waiting for Murphy's return, the time merely being occupied by Bridges dictating his report on the Maritime hearings to Dawn [1276] Lovelace, my wife.

“Shortly after midnight, Murphy arrived and almost immediately a discussion was entered into in which we all participated relative to the current situation on the waterfront in San Francisco. While I can not remember the details of this conversation, it hinged around the fact that Bridges believed that the waterfront employers in San Francisco were going to attempt to lock out the waterfront workers. A discussion was held around the position of the Communist Party toward this problem, and finally as a result of the discussion, some time early in the morning, Bridges and Murphy went out presumably to send a telegram to Henry Schmidt, President of the Longshoremen's local in San Francisco outlining the tactics that the longshoremen were to pursue in order to prevent the waterfront employers from locking them out.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

"I think it could be safely assumed that it was taken for granted that all of the people present in my apartment at the previously mentioned meeting were members of the Communist Party.

"Sometime subsequent to the meeting with Bridges in my apartment, James Murphy, Section Organizer, Portland Section, Communist Party informed me in private discussion that it was wise for all party members to stay away from Bridges; that he was too hot and the employers were after him and it might help the employers get him.

"I only had occasion to see Bridges twice after the meeting [1277] in my apartment—one time to pass him on 3rd Street near Salmon in Portland, Oregon, and to just say "Hello" and go on by; the other time was to listen to him present his side of a controversy in the Auditorium of the Labor Temple in Portland, Oregon.

"In addition to the foregoing, without any concrete evidence, such as attending a party meeting which had been called for a specific purpose, or seeing a membership book issued to Harry Bridges under his own name or alias, I was so firmly convinced due to the closeness with which Bridges worked with the party due to the manner in which his attitude and work was approved by the party, that had Bridges appeared at the most secret meeting of any grouping of the Communist Party wherein I was serving as door keeper and asked for admission, I would have unhesitatingly admitted him to that meeting.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

"I have dictated this statement of my own volition without any coercion and without any promise of remuneration, monetary award, or other inducement.

(Signed) R. L. LOVELACE." [1278]

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I understand that this is being introduced, of course, as the statement of Mr. R. L. Lovelace, deceased.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have here—they have just been laid on the desk—photostatic copies of the Post Office rental.

Do you want to see them?

Mr. Gladstein: The same ones that you had reference to this morning?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: Weren't there several other pages, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: There were several pages underneath the first one, but they haven't furnished those and I don't know whether I asked for them. I don't recall at this time whether I did or not. I don't believe they are important, in any event, unless you want them.

Mr. Gladstein: No; I simply wanted to ask if this was the complete set of documents to which you have reference and which the record shows were introduced.

Mr. Grossman: This is all you intended to introduce?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I am willing to stipulate this is all we had reference to.

Presiding Inspector: Anything further from the witness?

Direct Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Del Guercio: [1279]

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, while serving on the Voice of Action did you receive any special instructions from Lowell Wakefield regarding particularly building the Maritime Federation of the Pacific under Bridges' leadership? A. Yes, I did.

Q. And what were those instructions?

A. During that summer the Voice of Action, the Portland Bureau of the Voice of Action was located in the McKay Building in Portland, and in the next office the American Radio Telegraphers Association was located, the Portland Local. And during the course of building and consolidating the Maritime Federation I was instructed to cultivate and win the confidence of the Secretary of the American Radio Telegraphers Association in order to break down his resistance to Harry Bridges—he had been quite an opponent of Harry Bridges—to break it down in order to win his support for the Bridges' Presidency of the Maritime Federation.

Q. And who gave you those instructions?

A. Lowell Wakefield and James Couer.

Q. I believe you have previously testified that Lowell Wakefield was a member of the Communist Party at that time? A. Yes, sir.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Was on the District Committee of the Communist Party, is that correct?

A. Yes, he was, that is true. [1280]

Q. And that Mr. Couer was also a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Have you ever been arrested, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. I have on one occasion.

Q. On one occasion. When was that?

A. In 19—in November 1933.

Q. And what for?

A. I believe the charge was—first was disorderly conduct and then changed to obstructing traffic. It was in the course of an unemployed demonstration. That was shortly after we returned from Washington, D. C., when Mr. Lovelace—

Q. (Interposing) Shortly after you and your husband returned from Washington, D. C.?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever been on relief, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. For what period of time?

A. In Portland from—well, we were certified for relief, in order to be on WPA. We were on relief much of the time we were participating in this activity.

Q. And you are now the sole support of yourself and your child?

A. I am.

Q. And you are working on what sort of a Project? [1281]

A. Writers' Project.

Q. Writers' Project?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Yes. I believe that I will receive a pension, however, as a result of my husband's death.

Q. A pension as a widow of a world war veteran?

A. As a widow of a world war veteran who died as a result of injuries received while in active service.

Q. It hasn't come through yet? A. No.

Mr. Del Guercio: You may cross examine.

Presiding Inspector: Just a minute. I would like to ask a few questions.

What is your education?

The Witness: High School and some University Extension.

Presiding Inspector: And can you tell us in substance what you said to the men in your house in remonstrance against his bringing Mr. Bridges there? Try to put yourself back to the time and tell us what you said if you can.

The Witness: Well, we were standing at the door, as I recall it, and I turned to Hugh Adams and asked him why he brought Bridges to our apartment. As I recall, I made some rather elliptical reference to the fact that we were pretty well labeled.

Presiding Inspector: Referring to being known as Communists?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: And to this you don't remember that [1282] he made any reply?

The Witness: No, I don't. I think he smiled.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: You may object to this if you wish.

Mr. Gladstein: We have no objection.

Presiding Inspector: What was the reason that you made this remark of remonstrance?

The Witness: Well, because I felt that for Harry Bridges to be seen at our apartment, had other people dropped in at our apartment at the same time, it would have placed his reputation and his work in jeopardy.

Presiding Inspector: If I am not right about this you correct me—you thought at the time it wasn't well for him to be known as associating with Communists?

The Witness: Yes. That is true. As a matter of fact, your Honor, James Murphy, and other leading members of the Communist Party, had warned us not to associate with Mr. Bridges, particularly in public. That same condition applied to various Communists and leaders in trade union work.

Presiding Inspector: I asked about your knowledge of the circumstances recited in your husband's statement. Of course, some of those occurred elsewhere, and when you said that you knew about them you didn't refer to those, but you were referring to those that happened right about you, or else that you knew them from what your husband had told you?

The Witness: Indirectly—I was with my husband all of [1283] the time.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: You were? Did you go to Washington with him?

The Witness: I was with him in Washington.
D. C.

Presiding Inspector: I think I have asked questions which left matters somewhat hanging, and I have tried to merely elucidate them.

Mr. Gladstein: We have no objection to that.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, proceeding from where Judge Sears left off, would it be correct to say that despite yourself being ill at ease and rebuking Mr. Adams, that Mr. Bridges seemed to feel at ease?

A. Yes, I believe Mr. Bridges was at ease.

Q. Now, is there anything that enables you to fix the date when this incident occurred?

A. Yes; the fact that it was during the week of the 1935 Oregon State Federation of Labor Convention, and immediately preceding the demonstration of August 17, 1935.

Q. Do you recall what time in the evening Mr. Bridges came to your apartment?

A. I believe it was between 8:00 and 9:00.

Q. Do you remember what you were doing before you answered the door?

A. I was writing. [1284]

Q. You weren't typing, but were writing?

A. I was composing on the typewriter.

Q. Do you remember what you were composing?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. I don't remember exactly, but no doubt it was copy for the Voice of Action, Western Worker and Daily Worker.

Q. Now, after Mr. Bridges and Mr. Adams had come to the apartment, did Mr. Adams tell you what they had come for?

A. He asked for Matt Meehan. He said they were looking for Matt Meehan. Part of my rebuke was wondering why they should be looking for Matt Meehan in our apartment. There was no reason for it.

Q. Did he mention that Mr. Bridges had a desire to have some typing done, some notes?

A. He didn't mention it at the time. In fact, mention of the typing came in an off-hand way later.

Q. How late did Mr. Bridges stay there?

A. Until after midnight. It was quite late, in fact. As I recall, my husband objected to the lateness of the hour, and Mr. Bridges made some remark about, "You ought to see the way we do it in San Francisco. We sit up all night."

Q. When you say your husband objected, at what point did he object?

A. He wanted to go to bed.

Q. I didn't ask why. At what point did he do that? A. Oh, shortly before they left.

Q. Were you still typing Mr. Bridges' notes up at that [1285] time?

A. Possibly not. I think I was through with

2000

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

that. I am not sure, but I think I made an extra copy.

Q. Was it a long report?

A. It was quite long; yes.

Q. That is the one you made for Mr. Bridges?

A. Yes.

Q. And did he dictate it or did he have notes composed, or what?

A. He had notes from which he was reading and I think he used the notes to refresh his memory and dictated.

Q. Did you take his dictation directly on the typewriter? A. Yes, I did.

Q. How long a report, according to your best recollection, was this when it was completed?

A. I think there were about four pages single space typing.

Q. Do you remember anything about the subject matter of the report?

A. Just vaguely. It had to do with a meeting with O'Grady, I believe, in Washington, D. C.

Q. Mr. O'Grady?

A. Yes. Much of the conversation during the evening had dealt with that meeting, and also with the District Committee Meeting, the ILA District Executive Committee Meeting.

Q. International Longshoremen's Association?

[1286]

A. Yes.

Q. It covered Union affairs, is that right?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. That is, the Longshoremen's Union?

A. Yes.

Q. A few moments ago you said, I believe, in answer to one of Judge Sears' questions, that one of the reasons that you gave this rebuke to Mr. Adams was that at some prior time Mr. Murphy had warned you and your husband to not associate with Mr. Bridges? A. Yes; that is true.

Q. Were you with your husband at the time this warning was given by Mr. Murphy?

A. It was also passed on to me.

Q. I say, were you with your husband at the time Mr. Murphy gave that warning?

A. No, I don't believe I was with him at the time of any definite instructions.

Q. Was it passed on to you by your husband?

A. It was passed on to me by my husband and by others.

Q. This was prior to the time that Mr. Adams and Mr. Bridges came to your house?

A. Yes; and afterwards.

Q. Can you name all of the people who were present in your apartment immediately after Mr. Bridges and Mr. Adams arrived? [1287]

A. My husband, Richard Lovelace, and myself, Hugh Adams and Harry Bridges, and this fellow Starr and one person whom I don't remember.

Q. Later in the evening I think you said Mr. Murphy came in? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he walk in uninvited or did someone go to seek him?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. My husband went to locate him and found him not at home and left a note.

Q. Do you recall at all how the question of Mr. Murphy came into being invited to come to your party came up?

A. No, I don't recall exactly. It arose spontaneously. There was no incident to fix it in my mind.

Q. You don't recall who suggested it?

A. No.

Q. When would you say with respect to the time when Mr. Bridges left, that is, with respect to when he left, how long before that did Mr. Murphy come into your apartment?

A. I think it must have been as late as 1:30 or 2:00 o'clock before they left, and it was around midnight that James Murphy came in.

Q. When you say "before they left", referring to "they" do you refer to Mr. Adams, Mr. Starr, Mr. Bridges and the other man who was with him?

[1288]

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I am not sure just what your testimony on this was. Is it your testimony that Mr. Bridges was receiving instructions of any kind from your husband and from Mr. Murphy on this question of the telegram to send to San Francisco?

A. No, that was not my testimony; I wouldn't say that. Mr. Bridges was conferring with Mr. Murphy and with my husband participating, in the question of the content of this telegram.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Do you remember what the subject matter of the telegram was?

A. I don't remember exactly, no.

Q. Are you sure that it was to be addressed to Mr. Schmidt?

A. I couldn't be too dogmatic about that; I think it was: the same Schmidt entered the conversation.

Q. At that time your husband was a member of a trade Union?

A. No, he was not.

Q. Had he ever held a trade union position?

A. What is that?

Q. Had he ever held a trade union position of any kind?

A. Well, not within recent years. He had earlier when he was working for the—I believe the Southern Pacific. I think he was an officer in the Railway Clerks. [1289]

Q. How long prior to 1935 was that?

A. Oh, that must have been in the twenties; it was before I knew him.

Q. You said that Mr. Adams was a member of the Communist Party. Do you know that of your own knowledge?

A. Yes, I know it of my own knowledge.

Q. What is that knowledge?

A. The knowledge is the method of working with him, the fact that I was told by the Communist functionary in charge of trade union work on the waterfront that Hugh Adams would be

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

the contact, Hugh Adams relationship between me and the ILA activities.

Q. Now, what was this method of working that you have mentioned?

A. That is rather a general question.

Q. Well, you referred to—you used the expression—you said in answer to my question as to what constituted your knowledge, you said "My method of working with Mr. Adams." I think that is the expression you used. What did you mean by that expression?

A. Do you want a specific instance?

Q. Well, can you answer it generally first? If you can, you might say so.

A. Well, for instance, I would receive information to [1290] be reported in The Voice of Action from Hugh Adams.

Q. To be reported in The Voice of what?

A. Yes, The Voice of Action, this paper that I was associated with.

Q. Yes. You would receive information from Mr. Adams?

A. Yes, relative to union activities.

Q. Yes.

A. And he formed the original or the initial contact with Matt Meehan, introduced me to Matt Meehan.

Q. Who was Matt Meehan at that time?

A. Matt Meehan was a member of the Executive Board of the ILA. I don't recall just what position. Oh, he was a dispatcher, that is right.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Is that a position of importance?

A. What is that?

Q. Was it a position of importance?

A. Considerably.

Q. That is, was he both dispatcher and on the Executive Board, or was he on the Executive Board by virtue of being a dispatcher, do you know?

A. I couldn't say as to that. I only know he was a dispatcher.

Q. When you say the ILA do you mean what was known as the Pacific Coast District of the ILA? Do you know?

A. Well, I suppose the Portland Local was a part of the [1291] Pacific Coast District.

Q. Do you know whether Mr. Mehan at that time was a district officer, that is, a district officer by virtue of that dispatcher's position?

A. No, I don't believe he was.

Q. You said that you don't recall how the question of Mr. Murphy came up, when it did Mr. Bridges seemed to be agreeable. Do you remember anything that was said in that connection?

A. No, I don't remember anything of any moment. The question of Mr. Murphy, as I say, came up spontaneously. There was no discussion about it particularly.

Q. Do you recall anything that was discussed prior to the mention of Mr. Murphy being made?

A. Yes, there was considerable discussion of Mr. Bridges' experiences in Washington, his relationship with what constituted the opposition to his

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

policy in the Maritime Unions, and one comment that Mr. Bridges made was that while he was on the East Coast he noticed that—I don't recall that he even used the term Communist Party—I don't believe he did—but that they sent YCL—Young Communist League girls out on the waterfront to contact longshoremen and seamen, and he spoke of it—made the comment with considerable disgust.

[1292]

Q. Would it be correct to say that he was discussing in an off-hand or social manner his recent experiences in the East? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, just before the close of the direct examination Mr. Del Guercio asked you about some instructions that you had received with respect to breaking down, through the medium of The Voice of Action, certain opposition to Mr. Bridges in the Maritime Federation. A. Yes, sir. [1293]

Q. I didn't get the names of the people, or the name of the person who gave you those instructions. Do you care to repeat those?

Mr. Del Guercio: Do you want the reporter—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) It is shorter to simply ask it now.

Presiding Inspector: It is repetition but it is all right.

A. Lowell Wakefield and James Couer both instructed me.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When did this occur?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Oh, it occurred over a period of time. It was—you understand that these things don't occur in static meetings or formal meetings.

Q. Well, beginning—

A. Well, it occurred as soon as it was discovered that we were next door to the ARTA crowd.

Q. Well, when was that?

A. How is that?

Q. When was that?

A. It must have been in May. I think we took The Voice of Action office—established The Voice of Action office in May of 1935. [1294]

Q. That is in May of 1935?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, would you say that your first instructions with respect to attempting, through the medium of The Voice of Action, to break down opposition to Mr. Bridges in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific came in May 1935 or shortly thereafter?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was the person in the ARTA with whom you were supposed or for whom you were supposed to do some work?

The Witness: Your Honor, I hesitate to answer that. Could I explain the circumstances?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I have no objection to your explaining.

The Witness: This Secretary of the ARTA has been very ill. I don't know him to be still alive, and his wife, however, is still alive, and, if it isn't necessary I would rather not mention their names.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Well, exactly what were you supposed to do with this person anyway?

A. Oh, talk matters over with him, win his friendship and confidence, and previously he had been very outspoken in his resentment of Harry Bridges. One remark he made was [1295] that the Maritime Federation was just a tail to Bridges' kite, and another remark that he made was that he was afraid that the Federal Government, if the Maritime Federation continued, that the Federal Government would take over the Merchant Marine, and I don't know how much validity there was to his opinion but his opposition to Harry Bridges was based on such a concept.

Q. Do you recall whether he mentioned to you—I will withdraw that.

First of all, these remarks that you attribute to him, they were made to you, were they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Incidentally, the ARTA you are referring to, that is the American Radio Telegraphers Association?

A. Yes, that is true. I believe it has since expanded and became the American Communications Association.

Q. Now, you say you received instructions to—you used the phrase "work on him": is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you proceeded to do so?

A. Yes, sir.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. It was in the course of that that this gentleman made such remarks to you? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And so these conversations with him would have [1296] occurred in or shortly after May, 1935; correct?

A. Yes, that is about right. I hadn't met this gentleman prior to May, 1935.

Q. Now, this person in the ARTA on whom you were working, did he occupy an important position?

A. He was Secretary of the Local.

Q. That is the Local of the ARTA?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he hold a position in the Federation?

A. Yes, he was a member of the Columbia River District Council, Executive Committee.

Q. That is, he would be an important person in the Maritime Federation?

A. Yes. The understanding that I received was that he pretty much swung the balance of power in the Columbia River District Council.

Q. Did he express to you any particular issues on which he was in disagreement with Mr. Bridges?

A. No, except the Maritime Federation generally. I don't recall any specific issues that he discussed with me; he may have.

Q. When you say "generally" what do you mean?

A. He objected to the idea of a Maritime Federation.

Q. Oh! And would it be correct to say that his [1297] opposition, his outspoken opposition

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

made to you of Mr. Bridges in connection with the Federation was that he charged that the Federation was under the domination of the Mr. Bridges?

A. That was that, and he was also suspicious of Communists.

Q. Was The Voice of Action pretty generally known as a Communist paper?

A. Well, I see no reason why it could fool people.

Q. I think you said you were pretty open in your Communist views? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Despite those facts you were assigned to work on a man who was suspicious of Communists, is that correct? A. That is true.

Q. And this man from the ARTA, would it be correct to say that he was a man upon whom Bridges did not have any influence?

A. Yes, I gathered that he didn't listen to Harry Bridges a great deal at first. I also gathered that he became quite a follower of Harry Bridges afterwards.

Q. Later on? A. Yes, sir.

Q. But at that time he was not?

A. No. [1298]

Q. Would you say that his change toward Harry Bridges was due in any part to your work with him?

A. I believe so. We became quite good friends.

Q. Are you a citizen, Mrs. Lovelace?

A. I am.

Q. By birth or naturalization?

A. By birth.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Now, I think you said you were present when Mr. Lovelace signed the statement that Mr. Del Guercio had you read today? A. I was.

Q. Either at that time, or before or after, did you make any statement of a similar character?

A. Yes; I made a statement afterwards.

Q. Afterwards?

A. In fact, Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter were present in my apartment at my invitation.

Q. How long afterward would you say?

A. A short time afterward, two or three days.

Q. So your statement came after you had read your husband's statement?

A. Yes; but we had discussed the matter at great length before.

Q. Before he had made his statement?

A. We always worked together. [1299]

Q. Did you agree pretty much in your recollections as you had discussed this thing, as to what had happened the night Mr. Bridges came to your apartment?

A. We agreed on the basic facts because basic facts are basic facts. We disagreed on some of the details. I think you will notice some disparity between my husband's statement and my testimony. The question of Matt Meehan was one point of disagreement.

Q. Would it be correct to say that the first time that you saw agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with this case was on

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

one or more of the occasions when they were obtaining a statement from your husband?

A. Yes, that is true.

Q. And subsequently you saw FBI Agents in connection with the taking of your statement?

A. Yes; that is true.

Q. After they had taken your statement did you have occasion to see FBI Agents any more after that?

A. Oh, yes; on occasions; particularly at the time of my husband's illness, death.

Q. Any other occasion?

A. Yes. I think Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter—I think I visited them on the two or three occasions in the course of their visits to Portland, in the course of their investigation.

Q. Could you briefly define, or refer to the various [1300] separate occasions on which you met with FBI Agents, either at your home, or at their offices, or anywhere else—could you simply say, "The first time was this," briefly, and "The next time was this," and so on?

A. Well, the first time was when I turned my statement—after their visit to my apartment—when I turned my statement over to them.

Another occasion was when they asked if it would be possible to fix the date more specifically. We visited them one evening both myself and my husband.

Q. Did you make another statement on that occasion?

A. No.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. You made only one statement?

A. One statement.

Q. When was the next time?

A. I don't recall that I saw Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter at all after that.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, may I object to this line of questioning? I don't think it is important or of any value how many times the FBI Agents visited her unless they have something in back of their mind.

Presiding Inspector: They probably have. I will take it. This is cross examination.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. On any of the occasions when you met with FBI Agents, [1301] Mrs. Lovelace, were there any people present, outside of yourself, your husband, and the Agents? A. No.

Q. On any occasion?

A. No, I don't believe so.

Q. Was it possible there might have been someone and you don't recall it?

A. I am quite sure we never met with them when anybody else was present.

Q. Was any other person present, to your best recollection at any time on any of these occasions?

A. No.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, that has been asked and answered.

Presiding Inspector: I think she has answered that. She has answered again now.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Could you state how many times in all you spoke with FBI Agents concerning your testimony in this case?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that. That has been asked and answered before.

Presiding Inspector: If you can answer anything further you may do so, if you recall.

A. No more than four. I don't believe there were that many. [1302]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Give it some thought, if you will, and see if you can remember.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't hear that.

Mr. Gladstein: First she said four, and then she said she thought, didn't believe it was that many. I wanted her to give it some thought.

The Witness: I said it was no more than four.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You think it was four? A. Yes.

Q. Would you describe the first one?

A. The first meeting?

Q. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that. It has already been done.

Presiding Inspector: I thought she had answered that.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think so. She has described the first occasion.

Mr. Del Guercio: The record will show she has.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: You mean when she talked over the statement first?

Mr. Gladstein: The record is not clear as to where the first occasion was, and who the people were, or even when it occurred. [1303]

Presiding Inspector: If you can answer you may.

A. The first occasion I met FBI Agents was in my apartment in my home.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When was that?

A. That was, I believe, in September, and they came at my invitation relayed by my husband.

Q. That is; you asked your husband to invite them?

A. Yes. As long as my husband had given a statement to the FBI, why it was agreeable with me that I should corroborate his statement.

Q. What was the next time?

A. That was on Thursday night; and on Saturday morning I went to the local field office of the FBI and saw Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter and turned over to them a typewritten statement.

Q. You typed it up? A. Yes, I did.

Q. At your house? A. Yes.

Q. And you turned it over to them?

A. I did.

Q. Did you sign it in their presence?

A. I did.

Q. Was anybody else present besides yourself and the Agents?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. My husband was present part of the time.

[1304]

Q. And no one else?

A. No one else.

Q. Now, that constitutes what, the first or the second time when you actually saw the FBI agents?

A. The second time.

Q. When was the third time?

A. Oh, there was one occasion when we met informally in Manning's, Manning's Coffee Shop. Mr. Coulter came in with my husband, and a group of us were having coffee there.

Q. Do you remember who was in the group?

A. I don't think that is material.

Q. You do recall, but you don't want to name them?

A. I see no reason for involving people who are not—

Q. (Interposing) Did these people who were in the group participate at all in the discussion?

A. Oh, we discussed various phases of life around us.

Q. Oh, no—I mean the discussion with the FBI agents.

A. It wasn't a formal discussion.

Q. Was it an informal discussion of the Bridges case?

A. The Bridges case entered into it; yes.

Q. Now, who were the people who were in that group?

A. How is that?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Who were the people who were in that group, please?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please—

Presiding Inspector: I think you may answer.

Mr. Del Guercio: She said there was no discussion about [1305] the Bridges case.

Presiding Inspector: She said the Bridges matter entered into the discussion, as I understand it.

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will withdraw my objection.

Presiding Inspector: She said the Bridges matter entered into the discussion and that is why she may give the names if she can.

A. Mr. Foss, Ed Foss, happened into Manning's when we were sitting there.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Who else?

A. My husband, myself, and Mr. Coulter.

Q. Who else was in the group to which Mr. Coulter and your husband came?

A. That is all there was.

Q. Well, I understood you to say that you were in Manning's with a group of people, and that Mr. Coulter and Mr. Lovelace happened into Manning's and saw you and this group of people, isn't that correct?

A. I had been with a group of people; I don't know whether you know Manning's in Portland or not. It is sort of a place where people sit down and somebody will drop in and talk a while and then somebody will leave.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. When you said "group" did you mean that word to refer [1306] only to Mr. Foss?

A. Well, I think we just about filled a booth. I think that those of us present constituted a group.

Q. This was before Mr. Coulter and Mr. Lovelace came in the restaurant, wasn't it?

A. No, I don't believe—I had been with some people and I believe Mr. Lovelace, my husband, and Mr. Coulter came in and sat down at the booth with me. Later Ed Foss came in.

Q. Well, which is the group that was discussing the Bridges case?

A. We discussed it informally.

Q. When you say "we" to whom do you refer?

A. We people that I just named.

Q. All right. When was the next time that you spoke to any FBI Agent concerning your statement, or testimony in the Bridges case?

A. I believe the next time was when we discussed the matter of whether or not we could fix the date definitely.

Q. Where did that occur?

A. In the FBI office.

Q. And who was present on that occasion?

A. My husband, myself, Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter.

Q. Anybody else? A. Nobody else.

Q. Has there been any occasion since that time when you spoke to any FBI agent concerning your testimony, or your state- [1307] ment, or anybody else's testimony in this case?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. No, I don't believe so, except in the course of preparation to come down to San Francisco.

Q. Do you mean since you came to San Francisco or before?

A. Before I came to San Francisco. It was after I had been served with a subpoena.

Q. Where were you served with a subpoena?

A. At home.

Q. What took place on that occasion?

A. Not very much. An agent of the Immigration Department, whom I had never met before, came to the Apartment and told me he had a subpoena for me, and that is about all.

Q. That is all that happened then?

A. Yes.

Q. I was asking you whether there was any occasion, after the one that you described where you were asked to come to the FBI offices and think about the question of specifying the date, I was asking whether subsequent to that there was any occasion on which you discussed your statement, or your testimony, or anybody else's testimony in this case?

Presiding Inspector: Whatever occurred, you don't want to infer that you made an accurate statement about what occurred, but that was merely for identification?

Mr. Gladstein: For identification. I am not doing any [1308] testifying.

Presiding Inspector: You made certain statements in there as to what occurred.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Mr. Gladstein: Let me clear it up.

Presiding Inspector: That is merely for identification.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right.

Presiding Inspector: There was some discussion about the date, and they asked if you could fix it more definitely. Did you have any further conversation with Government agents or agencies?

The Witness: Yes. I had some conversations with Mr. King, of the FBI, in Portland.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was this after the time when you were asked to come up to the FBI office and go over the question of specifying the exact date?

A. Yes.

Q. By the way, could you possibly fix the date of that occasion when you were asked to go to the FBI office in connection with this date?

A. No, I don't believe I could.

Q. Any idea at all?

A. There is nothing to fix the date by.

Q. Since that time you say you discussed the matter with Mr. King?

A. Not the Bridges case; no. [1309]

Q. Well, what did you discuss?

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, if the Court please, she said she didn't discuss the Bridges case. Certainly counsel don't want to go into any other matter she may have discussed.

Presiding Inspector: No.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. All I want, Mrs. Lovelace, is the occasions on which you discussed with any representatives of the Government, or anybody else who may have been present, either your statement to the FBI in this case or the testimony that you were to give in this case, or the testimony or statement of anybody else to be given in this case. You understand the question, don't you?

A. Yes, I understand it. I believe you have it.

Q. And you mentioned Mr. King. Is that one of the occasions?

A. We didn't discuss the Bridges case as such, no.

Q. Why did you mention Mr. King then?

A. Because I saw Mr. King before I came down here to receive instructions from him as to how I should conduct myself, about transportation—just routine procedure.

Q. Is he the last person you saw representing the Government in connection with this case before coming down here? A. Yes.

Q. Let me take you back for a moment to the time when you were in Manning's. You say Mr. Foss dropped in and sat [1310] down and had coffee with you, Mr. Coulter, and your husband, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Is Mr. Foss a friend of yours?

A. I met him during the election campaign last year, November 1940, October or November.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Was he a friend of your husband's?

A. He was a political friend, of course, of the democratic election campaign.

Q. And since you met him has he been a friend of yours?

A. Yes; casually.

Q. Were any introductions made on this occasion at Manning's?

A. Yes.

Q. Who introduced whom?

A. I believe my husband introduced Mr. Coulter and Mr. Foss, and they then didn't recall that I had already met Mr. Foss and asked if we were acquainted. I had met Mr. Foss just once before.

Q. Did Mr. Lovelace introduce Mr. Coulter as a representative of the FBI?

A. No, I don't believe so. We were having a cup of coffee and nobody was on official business.

Q. Do you know what he said in making the introduction?

A. I think he said "Mr. Coulter, meet Mr. Foss," or words [1311] to that effect.

Q. Have you ever talked to Mr. Adams about the testimony to be given in this case?

A. Yes, I have; rather, Mr. Adams talked to me.

Q. On how many occasions did you have such a discussion?

A. Once.

Q. Where did it occur?

A. Partly in my apartment, and partly in Manning's Restaurant.

Q. Was anybody else present in either of those places on the occasion of this discussion?

A. Mr. Adams came to my apartment to tell me,

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

or to tell us, rather, he was looking for both me and my husband—my husband didn't happen to be home at the time—and he wanted to know, that is, he told me he had been approached by two Agents of the FBI, and he said that he had given them a statement and he wanted us to back him up.

Q. Back him up on the statement?

A. Yes.

Q. You mean to verify the contents?

A. Yes. And I told him that it was impossible for me to do so; that I saw no reason why I should commit perjury, or involve myself in something for the sake of something I didn't believe in.

Mr. Del Guercio: I didn't get the last answer to that. May I have the reporter read it, please?

Presiding Inspector: Read it, Mr. Reporter.

[1312]

(The answer referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, I don't quite understand. I will ask that—

Presiding Inspector: Go back and read a number of questions and answers previous to the last answer.

(That portion of the record referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Gladstein: On the occasion that you made that remark to Mr. Adams had he shown you his statement to the FBI?

A. No. He told me he had made one. He told

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

me he had made a statement. I suggested that he wanted to see both my husband and me, and I suggested we talk down town—I had an appointment to meet my husband in Manning's—and I suggested we walk down town and see him. I informed Mr. Adams that I couldn't back up his statement; that I didn't feel justified in it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Well, how did you know on that occasion what was in the statement?

A. Because Mr. Adams told me.

Q. Told you what?

A. What his statement—the content of his statement. [1313]

Q. Did you ever actually see the statement?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Where did you see it?

A. In the FBI office.

Q. When was that?

A. When I went out with Mr. Adams.

Q. When was that?

A. I went with Mr. Adams to Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter.

Q. Why didn't you mention this visit with Mr. Adams to the FBI offices before when I was asking you for all the occasions?

A. You won't believe this: It hadn't occurred to me.

Q. All right. Tell us what happened at the time that you and Mr. Adams were in the offices of the FBI?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Well, I told Mr. Robey and Mr. Coulter that I understood that Mr. Adams had made a statement.

Q. You told them that?

A. Yes, sir. I think Mr. Adams opened the conversation and—oh, I don't recall just how the conversation developed, but the content of it was—the general content was that Mr. Adams' statement was in error.

Q. Who made that statement?

A. How is that?

Q. Who made that statement that his statement was in error? [1314]

A. I don't recall that anybody made it specifically.

Presiding Inspector: She said that is her present interpretation of it.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

The Witness: Mr. Adams admitted his statement was in error.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did he change it?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. In his own hand?

A. Well, he didn't change it in writing; he simply negated it.

Q. Was another statement made for him?

A. What is that?

Q. Was another statement made for him?

A. I don't know whether it was or not. I didn't inquire into it; I don't know what happened after that.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Did he mention how he happened to be wrong?

A. You mean why he happened to be wrong or—

Q. Well, did he mention first of all in what respects the statement he had given was wrong?

A. His statement was wrong in the period, both the year and the date. I believe he had Bridges' visit to our apartment in 1937. The purpose of the visit, what occurred at the visit, all were in variance with the facts, with the [1315] facts.

Q. Did he say that?

A. Well, he admitted as much, yes.

Q. When you say "he admitted as much"—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, I think her answer is perfectly clear.

Just read the question and answer.

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, that is her statement as to not what he said, but what she now says.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I want to ask you this: Are you now saying that Mr. Adams on this occasion, when you and Mr. Adams and the two FBI Agents were present at the FBI offices, that Mr. Adams admitted that his statement previously given to the FBI was wrong in the particulars that you mentioned?

Presiding Inspector: Now, are you asking her as to what she said, or are you asking her as to what she now testifies to?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Mr. Gladstein: I am asking her now whether Mr. Adams did say these things.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't so understand your question. I may be wrong about it. How does the question start? [1316]

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Presiding Inspector: You see, you are asking her—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) I will withdraw that part of the question "Are you now saying."

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is it your testimony on the occasion referred to in the last question, Mrs. Lovelace, Mr. Adams, in your presence, admitted the statement he had previously given to the FBI was wrong in the particulars that you have testified? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Namely, date, purpose of visit to your house and what took place on the occasion of that visit?

A. Yes, that is true.

Q. And what, if anything, was done after he made this admission?

A. I don't recall that anything was done.

Q. Was he asked by the FBI to make corrections in the statement?

A. I don't know. I don't know any more about the relationship of Hugh Adams.

Presiding Inspector: He means on that occasion.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

The Witness: No, they didn't on that occasion.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you and Mr. Adams leave together on that occasion?

A. No, Mr. Adams left separately. [1317]

Q. Before or after you?

A. He left before I did.

Q. Now, on the day—I think you said that Mr. Adams in his statement had said that it was in 1937?

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Do you remember what month in 1937?

Presiding Inspector: Do you mean what he said?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: How is that material as to what Mr. Adams said?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, if your Honor wishes me to disclose this I will have to.

Presiding Inspector: I would like to have you disclose the point of that. Mr. Adams isn't a witness.

Mr. Gladstein: That may be true, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Are you anticipating that he may be a witness?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know. The Government may call him.

Presiding Inspector: Well, is that what you are anticipating?

Mr. Gladstein: No. As a matter of fact, this is simply for the purpose of examination in order to bring out matters involving credibility. [1318]

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't see how it affects her credibility as to what Mr. Adams did or did not say. You couldn't in any way contradict her on that. If you want it you may have it, but I don't see that it is material.

Mr. Gladstein: May I have the question?

Presiding Inspector: You may, yes. Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Presiding Inspector: That means what month in 1937 he said it was?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

A. No, I don't remember.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was the statement read to you, the statement of Mr. Adams read to you at that time?

A. It was shown to me.

Q. Well, you read it, did you?

A. Yes, briefly.

Q. What is that?

A. I read it briefly. I didn't study it or memorize it.

Q. Well, did you, as you were reading it, notice these errors?

A. I noticed the discrepancies, yes, the discrepancies.

Q. Did you remark upon them?

A. Yes, sir. [1319]

Q. Were there any other discrepancies, as you

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

call it, other than those you have mentioned which you remarked upon?

A. Yes, there were various discrepancies. I said that—I don't recall whether this was in the statement or in conversation—but he seemed to think that some woman was with him and Harry Bridges at the time they came to our apartment, which was definitely not true, and about the only thing in his statement that was true was that we had some sandwiches and coffee. I believe that was true.

Q.: Well, you don't mean that you had sandwiches and coffee at the FBI offices?

A. No, I mean the night of—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Counsel knows that the witness meant.

Presiding Inspector: That is perfectly clear.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You meant at your house?

Presiding Inspector: That was perfectly clear.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you remember when that was served?

A. No, I don't. Usually when we have visitors at our apartment we have a cup of coffee, if they desire it.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. Gladstein: Ready, your Honor? [1320]

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Just a few more questions, Mrs. Lovelace.

Now, on the occasion which you and Mr. Adams were in the FBI office and you were reading his statement and remarking about those things which you claimed were wrong, did you claim that his statement was wrong with respect to whether, at the time Mr. Bridges was in your house, the discussion included conversation concerning the position of the Communist Party toward the problem being discussed?

The Witness: Will you read the question? What was that question again?

Presiding Inspector: Read it.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question as being too vague, uncertain. I can't understand it.

Mr. Gladstein: I will ask the witness.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you understand the question, Mrs. Lovelace? A. No, I don't believe I do.

Mr. Gladstein: I will reframe it.

Presiding Inspector: It is a little complicated.

Mr. Gladstein: I will reframe it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Let me call your attention now to this occasion when you were in the office of the FBI and Mr. Adams was there [1321] and, as you have

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

stated, you read through his statement and you commented on certain things in that statement of Mr. Adams which you said were wrong.

A: Yes, sir.

Q: Was one of those things in the statement this question of whether or not on the evening that Mr. Bridges was in your house a discussion took place concerning the Communist Party policy toward the problem then being discussed?

Presiding Inspector: Now, isn't that a double question? Aren't you asking first what was in the statement and second whether it was correct?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, then, I will divide it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q: First of all, was there anything in Mr. Adams' statement as to whether or not Communism, or the Communist Party policy was discussed?

Presiding Inspector: Now, you are asking for the contents of a writing which you evidently have before you.

Mr. Gladstein: We do not have. I don't have that. The only exhibit I have is the one that the Government introduced.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Gladstein: That is Mr. Lovelace's. [1322]

Presiding Inspector: Is it very material as to what was in the statement of another man?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, yes.

Presiding Inspector: How is that material?

Mr. Gladstein: Well in the first place—

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Another man who is not a witness, unless you want to introduce it as your evidence?

Mr. Gladstein: No; we don't have that statement, but let me say that it is apparent—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I didn't think you wanted that.

Mr. Gladstein: It is apparent, your Honor, that a Mr. Adams made a statement concerning this same incident that was testified to by Mrs. Lovelace.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: That this statement was made to the FBI.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: This statement is, according to the present witness' testimony, inconsistent with her version of what took place on the night that Harry Bridges came to her house.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. Well, you brought this all up. This is original testimony, isn't it?

[1323]

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, but let me conclude, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: Now, the position, as we see it, is this: Either Mr. Adams will be produced by the FBI—that we do not know—I mean by the Government in this case. I don't know whether they intend to produce him or not but if they do produce him, then, it is obviously material for us.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

through this witness, or in any way in the case, to bring out anything that has taken place raising questions concerning statements by a witness to be produced.

Presiding Inspector: I know, but we can't assume he is going to be produced here. They may not think he is a credible witness.

Mr. Gladstein: All right; either that, either they produce him, or if they do not produce him, then, the question arises as to the failure or refusal to present testimony available to them.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no.

Mr. Gladstein: Approaching a question of suppression.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no, not at all; not on a statement. The rule doesn't go that far. Why don't you produce it? He is just as open to you as he is to them.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, as a matter of fact, this question comes out now through this witness.

Presiding Inspector: I know, but you have brought it [1324] out.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't come out on any real cross examination. It is an original matter that you are bringing out, something about a statement of Mr. Adams.

Mr. Gladstein: What has come out, your Honor, is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation obtained—

• Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I know.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

You don't have to repeat what has come out. I think I have listened to the testimony. But I think it is far removed from ordinary cross examination.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I have only a few questions on this particular topic that I would like to conclude with. I think that they are certainly material on the basis that I mentioned.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I think that is not a proper basis, but I will let you have them. All right, go ahead.

Mr. Gladstein: You don't have to go back. I think I have in mind the question I was asking.

Presiding Inspector: Ask it over again. First ask what is in the statement.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right, the statement of Mr. Adams.

Presiding Inspector: If she can remember.

[1325]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you recall whether there was in that statement anything with respect to whether Communism, or the Communist Party policy was discussed at your apartment on the evening when Mr. Bridges was there?

A. I believe there was a negative statement in regard to that. I believe there was a denial that the Communist Party, or Communist Party policy had been discussed.

Q. Now, do you recall whether in the statement—

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Now, wouldn't it have been proper for you to ask her directly if that was not a negative? Now, you have asked her something that was not the case, according to her testimony. Do you claim there was this statement, that that policy—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) I haven't seen the statement, your Honor. I asked the question whether there was any.

Presiding Inspector: But you led her as though you knew what was in it.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I am merely asking the witness whether there was mention made in the statement of Mr. Adams of this subject matter.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, but that wasn't as I understood it. It may be.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, would you read the question? [1326]

Presiding Inspector: Oh, it isn't necessary. She has already stated.

Mr. Gladstein: All right, your Honor. Well, let's see if I have this straight.

Presiding Inspector: She stated there was a negative statement to that effect.

Mr. Gladstein: That is, that there was a statement—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I think we understand the answer.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was there also, or was there in the statement that Mr. Adams made any mention of the man-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

ner in which James Murphy happened to come into your apartment that evening?

Presiding Inspector: If you can remember.

A. I don't remember. I don't recall that he mentioned James Murphy. The statement was very brief and inaccurate.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, let's go back for just a moment to the time when Mr. Bridges was in your apartment. From the time that he came in until the time that he left finally did he leave your apartment at any time? A. No, I don't believe so.

Q. And when he left I think you said that he left with Mr. Starr, the man, the unknown man who came with him, [1327] and with Mr. Adams, is that correct?

A. I believe that is correct. It seems to me that somebody left earlier.

Q. Well, your husband didn't leave earlier, did he? I mean, your husband stayed in your apartment? Would that be correct?

A. Yes, my husband stayed in the apartment.

Q. Did Mr. Murphy leave earlier?

A. I was trying to recall. No, I believe it is correct that they left together.

Q. Did Mr. Murphy go up to his apartment earlier or at the same time?

A. Yes, about the same time. They left at the conclusion of the discussion.

Q. You mentioned on direct examination that for a period of time you have been on relief, Mrs.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Lovelace. Would you give me the dates, beginning when and ending when?

A. Oh, I believe around 1933, '32 or '33.

Q. In what city? A. Portland.

Q. And continuing until when?

A. Well, the work on WPA means certifications, certified WPA employment. When my husband went to the hospital two years ago I was employed on the Federal Theatre Project.

Q. Well, then, you were on straight relief in 1932 and [1328] 1933 and then on WPA after that?

A. No; WPA started in 1935.

Q. In 1935?

A. Yes, sir. My husband was drawing partial disability compensation as a disabled veteran.

Q. Yes. Is it correct, then, you were on relief from 1932 until 1935? A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. And then from 1935 you were on WPA, the Writers Project in Portland?

A. Either the Writers Project--part of the time the theatre project. Previous to my husband going to the hospital a little over two years ago I had been doing some volunteer publicity work for the theatre project.

Q. Could you approximate the time in 1935 when you first went on WPA?

A. It was late in 1935; I don't recall the exact time.

Q. How late in the year?

A. About November, I think.

Q. Now, how long all together did you work for The Voice of Action?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Well, as a party member, as a Communist Party member I worked from May until, oh, about August or September. In the meantime I had asked for a leave of absence from party activity, Communist Party activity, in order to do some private [1329] writing, but I kept up a less stringent relationship with The Voice of Action than I had before, gradually tapered off.

Q. Until what date?

A. What is that?

Q. Until what date?

A. I believe Christmas 1935 was my last contribution to The Voice of Action. They asked me if I would write a short story for the Christmas issue.

Q. Your association with that paper began where?

A. Oh, it began in 1933, I believe in reporting on defense work.

Q. Did you ever receive remuneration for your work on that paper?

A. Never.

Q. When did your work on WPA cease?

A. When did my work on WPA cease?

Q. Yes, your job?

A. It has not ceased.

Q. Oh, it has continued since the time when it began in 1935?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. This all has been in Portland?

A. Yes, it has.

Q. Was your husband employed at any time since 1935? [1330]

A. Since 1935?

Q. Yes.

A. He was employed on the Oregon Writers

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Project and on the Survey of Federal Archives. He was employed steadily until he went to the hospital, I believe it was in April, 1939.

Q. He was not in private employment during that period from 1935 on? A. No. [1331]

Presiding Inspector: Is there any explanation to make about the present work that you are doing, or the work you have done since 1935 in relation to WPA work?

The Witness: Yes. I think one of the defense counsel's questions was a little bit misleading, or confusing.

Presiding Inspector: Misleading or confusing to you?

The Witness: Yes. But I believe it has been clarified.

Presiding Inspector: It has been clarified?

The Witness: Yes, sir.

Mr. Gladstein: What was the question?

Presiding Inspector: She told me she thought there was some misunderstanding between you but she now says it has been clarified.

Mr. Gladstein: That is all.

Mr. Del Guercio: No more questions.

Presiding Inspector: I would like to ask one question. Is there any explanation in this Voice of Action as to the title of the newspaper. Does it say "Organ of Militant Labor" or anything of that kind?

The Witness: Yes, I believe it does. Also on the masthead is the phrase "Independent Labor

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Paper," or something like that. I have forgotten just exactly what it is.

Presiding Inspector: Is the Communist Party mentioned?

The Witness: No, not on the masthead. It is mentioned in the columns of the paper, however.

Presiding Inspector: Just as it might be mentioned in [1332] the columns of any other newspaper?

The Witness: No. As a matter of fact, the Voice of Action was sometimes used as an organ for the statements of the District Committee of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: Over the signature of the District Committee?

The Witness: Yes; under the by-line of the District Organizer, Morris Rapport.

Mr. Del Guercio: May I ask a question or two?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have here a copy of the Voice of Action, the Friday, May 24, 1935 issue; and on the top of which appears, "The Northwest's Only Working Class Paper." And there is stamped in ink "Workers Book Shop, 64 Alder Street." Is that a copy of the Voice of Action by which you were employed? A. Yes.

Q. What is this address, "Workers Book Shop, 64 Alder Street?"

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. That was then the location of a place where they sold and distributed various pamphlets, the Daily Worker, the Voice of Action, and Western Worker.

Presiding Inspector: That you have already spoken of?

The Witness: Yes. [1333]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Is that a Communist Party book shop?

A. The Communist Party controlled it; yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this copy of the Voice of Action in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: You don't offer it for anything contained in it?

Mr. Del Guercio: No, other than the stamp that is shown on here, "Workers' Book Shop, 64 Alder Street."

Presiding Inspector: I want to understand you. There is no article in it that you wish to have me consider?

Mr. Del Guercio: No; just the nature of the paper.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. We will receive it with that understanding. There is no objection to it?

Mr. Gladstein: No objection.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't want to have the whole matter put in evidence.

(The newspaper referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 217.)

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May I have a moment, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, I show you another copy of the Voice of Action for April 19, 1935; and ask you if that is a copy of the Voice of Action paper at the time you were employed by them? [1334]

A. (Examining paper): Yes, it is.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, if your Honor please, for a specific purpose. On page 4 of this paper appears a photograph of James Murphy, and an article apparently edited by him, reading: "Special news for the lumber workers, edited by James Murphy, Secretary, National Lumber Workers Union."

Presiding Inspector: There is no objection?

Mr. Gladstein: No objection.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The newspaper referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 218.)

Presiding Inspector: Is that all with this witness?

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I might have the witness identify Mr. Murphy's picture which appears on the sheet. Is that the same Murphy who was in your apartment at the time Mr. Bridges was up there (examining picture)? A. It is.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace)

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all, if your Honor please. May the witness be excused?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. You may be excused.

Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, before the witness is excused.

I would like to say that this witness was put on today [1335] and we started our cross examination immediately. Obviously, we have had too little time to conduct any investigation at all in Portland, the place where this witness resides, and it would certainly be most difficult, and would be unreasonable to expect us, assuming we desire more cross examination, to have her brought back from Portland, which would involve a great deal of expense. So I would like to make what I think is a reasonable suggestion: That she be kept available, at least in the immediate vicinity, so it doesn't mean bringing her back from Portland until Monday morning, which isn't a long time; and in case we have any cross examination—any further cross examination, we will agree to be prepared by Monday morning for that; or to notify her the first thing Monday morning if we will not wish her any further. The only thing we can do is to ask; otherwise we will have to pay the expense of bringing her back from Portland.

Presiding Inspector: Any objection?

Mr. Del Guercio: That is not only unreasonable, but is unfair. Bearing in mind that these witnesses have a livelihood to make, and they have

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)—

appeared here, and they have been inconvenienced by being required to appear here, certainly they should be permitted to go home as soon as their testimony is over and not be kept here any unreasonable length of time.

We have produced a witness here, and her testimony has been given, and she has been cross examined extensively and [1336] exhaustively. Now, certainly if they want her again at any other time they should subpoena her, at their expense, and pay for her transportation, and pay her, as the rules provide, for any loss of employment, etc.

She has testified on the stand that she has a child to take care of.

Presiding Inspector: Has she the child with her?

Mr. Del'Guercio: I don't think she has; no.

Presiding Inspector: It is entirely uncertain whether you will want her.

Mr. Grossman: That is true.

Presiding Inspector: I think the likelihood is that you won't.

Mr. Grossman: I cannot say.

Presiding Inspector: Of course you can't.

Mr. Grossman: I cannot say since we have had no opportunity to investigate.

Presiding Inspector: You must have known about that.

Mr. Del Guercio: What is all this (indicating card file boxes on defense counsel table) in front of you, if they have had no time to investigate?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: I don't know. I was just beginning to wonder about that.

Mr. Del Guercio: It is practicing deceit.

Mr. Grossman: We are willing to state those occasions [1337] where we are generally or specifically prepared on particular witnesses and when we are not. I will give you my word as a counselor of this Court that we were not generally prepared or specifically prepared for this witness. If we had been we would not state that we were not; but we weren't and, therefore we had no opportunity to prepare at all, and we are being asked to meet what would probably be a very large expense to bring her back even for the smallest amount of additional cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: Hold her a few minutes and we will see.

(Witness temporarily excused.)

Presiding Inspector: Call your next witness.

Mr. Del Guercio: Will you take the stand, please? (Indicating.)

Presiding Inspector: Raise your right hand.

GEORGE B. VAN SYCKLE

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is your name?

(Testimony of George B. Van Syckle.)

A. George B. Van Syckle—V-a-n S-y-c-k-l-e.

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Van Syckle?

A. Berkeley. [1338]

Q. What is your occupation?

A. Adjuster.

Q. You are employed by whom?

A. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Q. You are under subpoena to produce certain records of that company. Did you bring them?

A. I did.

Q. Do you have them with you?

A. I have.

Q. May I have them?

A. (Producing records.)

Q. How long have you been employed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company?

A. By the Pacific Gas and Electric Company and its predecessor companies, twenty-nine years and three months.

Q. And were you so employed there during the year 1933?

A. In my present occupation as adjuster; yes.

Q. You have handed me an application for service dated San Francisco, California, 8/15/33, signature of applicant, Walter Lambert, tenant, for service at 3470-19th Street; name of applicant, Walter Lambert; occupied as halls; collection address, same; date service wanted 8/16/33; salesman, Ray J. Schinkel.

On the reverse side under "Occupation"—does

(Testimony of George B. Van Syckle.)

that mean [1339] the occupation of the applicant for service? A. Right.

Q. There is shown "Manager"; firm, Workers Ex-Service Men's League; business address, 3470-19th Street; if account guaranteed, name and address of guarantor, Marie Kirk, 264 Peninsula.

And a second application for service dated 8/12/33, made by Walter R. Lambert; location, 3470-19th Street; name of applicant Walter R. Lambert; occupied as assembly rooms; collection address, same; date service wanted, 8/14/33.

On the back of this card appears this information:

"Occupation, not employed."

That is the occupation of the applicant?

A. That is right.

Q. "If account guaranteed, name and address of guarantor, Marie Kirk, 264 Peninsula Avenue."

Did you take these applications, Mr. Van Syckle?

A. I did not take them personally. They were prepared under my direction.

Q. Prepared under your direction?

A. Yes; and I verified the originals.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer these two applications in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know whether an appropriate [1340] foundation has been laid because we didn't hear the answers to the last two questions.

Presiding Inspector: He said that he didn't take

(Testimony of George B. Van Syckle.)

these personally, but he verified them, and that they were taken under his direction.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Were they verified at the time they were taken, or within a short time thereafter?

A. I verified them today.

Q. You are the custodian of these records?

A. I am.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think a proper foundation has been laid for the introduction of the documents.

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to ask any questions before they are received?

Mr. Grossman: Just a moment.

Presiding Inspector: We will receive them.

(The applications for service were received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 219.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May we be permitted to photostat these records and substitute copies for the originals, both front and back?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Can you tell from your records for how long a period the applicant for service here, Walter Lambert, actually got [1341] service at that address?

A. I can.

Q. Will you tell us, please?

A. On the hall lighting, from August 17, 1933 to March 16, 1934.

(Testimony of George B. Van Syckle.)

On the assembly rooms, from August 15, 1933 to March 16, 1934.

Q. And were the bills for the service regularly paid? A. They were.

Q. And do your records show by whom they were paid? A. They do not.

Q. Does your record show to whom the bills were rendered? A. They do.

Q. And to whom were they rendered?

A. Walter Lambert.

Q. At what address?

A. 3470-19th Street, San Francisco.

Q. For the entire period of time that you have testified to?

A. For the entire period of time.

Mr. Del Guercio: You may cross examine.

Mr. Gladstein: We have no questions.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

(Witness excused.) [1342]

Presiding Inspector: Next witness.

Mr. Del Guercio: We have no other witness today.

Presiding Inspector: I think you had better keep the other witness, Mrs. Lovelace, until Monday.

We will now take a recess until Monday morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 P.M., an adjournment was taken to Monday, April 21, 1941, at 10:00

A.M.) [1343]

Court Room 276,
Federal Building,
San Francisco, California,
April 21, 1941.

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A.M.

[1344]

• PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, we have Mrs. Lovelace here.

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to cross examine Mrs. Lovelace further?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

DAWN LOVELACE

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Cross Examination
(Resumed)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mrs. Lovelace, are you acquainted with Captain Keegan of the Portland Police Department?

A. Yes; I know Captain Keegan.

Q. How long have you known him?

A. Oh, I believe I met him last Armistice Day.

Q. Of last year? A. Yes.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Was your husband present at the same time?

A. I believe so. It was in the course of an Armistice Day parade.

Q. Do you know whether your husband knew Captain Keegan prior to that time? [1345]

A. Yes; through his membership in the American Legion Post.

Q. Since that date has there been any social relationship between yourself, your husband and Captain Keegan?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, I object to the question.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. I don't know where it is leading.

A. Casually; yes, in the course of the American Legion activities.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. By that do you mean to imply that you visited his home or that he visited your home?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Have you ever made any reports to Captain Keegan? A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you ever supplied any information to him? A. No more than—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): If your Honor please, "any information" supplied any individual—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): You mean in relation to the Communist Party or Mr.——

Mr. Gladstein: No. I will make it more definite, your Honor.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: Very well. [1346]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you ever supplied any information to him with respect to union activities of any kind?

A. I have not.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: She has answered.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. To your knowledge did your husband make any reports or supply Captain Keegan with any information concerning labor or union activities?

A. I don't believe so—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interrupting): Just a moment!

A. (Continuing): —but I have no way of knowing.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, if I were to ask the same questions that I have just asked you, the last three or four, and substitute the expression "Communist activities" for the expression "labor or trade union activities" would your answers to all the questions have been the same?

A. I would like to qualify that.

Q. You may.

A. In the few instances in which I have talked with Captain Keegan casually, we have discussed the various social problems which confronted everybody in every community. Whether or not that

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

would be—could be construed as supplying [1347] information, it would be a matter of construction. There certainly has been no such relationship.

Q. No such relationship as what?

A. As an informant. And I believe Captain Keegan has enough respect for me that he wouldn't place me in such a position.

Q. Do you know Officer Brown of the Portland Police Department? A. I do.

Q. How long have you known him?

A. For about the same length of time.

Q. Did your husband to your knowledge know Officer Brown prior to the time when you became acquainted with him?

A. Yes. I believe they had known each other for years. I believe they were in the same company overseas.

Q. If I were to ask you the same questions with respect to Officer Brown and I have heretofore asked you concerning Captain Keegan—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Well, if your Honor please, I object to the form of the question. Is he going to ask her?

Mr. Gladstein: I will if Counsel insists. I was simply trying to save time.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it, in that form for the sake of expedition.

By Mr. Gladstein: [1348]

Q. Can you think of any question to which your answer would have been different in a sub-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Substantial way, Mrs. Lovelace, if I were to ask you concerning Captain Brown, or Officer Brown, the same questions I asked you this morning concerning Captain Keegan?

A. I would answer in the same manner with the same qualifications.

Q. Are you acquainted with Officer O'Dale?

A. Very casually.

Q. And to your knowledge was your husband acquainted with him?

A. He was also acquainted with him casually, I believe.

Q. If I were to ask the same questions with respect to Officer O'Dale that I have heretofore asked you concerning Captain Keegan would your answers be the same?

A. They would be substantially the same with the same qualifications.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, you are probably bound by these answers.

Mr. Gladstein: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: You are probably bound by these answers. I don't say that positively, but probably.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I think O'Dale is spelled—do you know how to spell it?

A: I believe it is O-D-a-l-e. Whether or not there is [1349] an apostrophe in the name, I don't know.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. Do you know a man named Lieutenant Mumpower?

A. I know him casually, too. I believe I met him—talked to him once, unless perhaps he spoke to me at my husband's funeral. [1350]

Q. He is also with the Portland Police Department?

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. All the men whose names we have mentioned this morning are of that department?

A. I believe so.

Mr. Del Guercio: How do you spell the last one?

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. How do you spell it?

A. M-u-m-p-o-w-e-r—just like it sounds.

Mr. Gladstein: I think that is correct.

The Witness: I wouldn't be sure.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. If I were to ask you the same questions with respect to yourself, and with respect to your husband, in reference to Lieutenant Mumpower that I have heretofore asked you concerning Captain Keegan, would your answers be substantially the same, and with the same qualifications?

A. There would be no qualifications whatsoever. I have had one casual conversation in the course of an introduction with Mumpower—whatever he is.

Q. Do you know Mario Bacon?

A. I know who he is. I have seen him once. The circumstances under which I saw him was the

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

occasion when he came to our home to arrest my husband.

Q. Are you in a position to say whether your husband [1351] sustained toward Mr. Bacon a relationship similar to that which you have described him to have sustained toward Captain Keegan and the others mentioned this morning?

A. I know nothing about any relationship with Bacon. In fact, I would like to make it clear right now that I am not speaking for my husband and his relationship with people during the past year of his life.

Q. Are you acquainted with Mr. Raphael Bonham?

A. I never met Mr. Bonham.

Q. Are you acquainted with Mr. Norene?

A. I have never met Mr. Norene.

Q. Do you know who those gentlemen are?

A. I know they are connected with the Immigration Service.

Q. Do you know Major Laurence Milner?

A. Yes, I have known him for years.

Q. During the past two years what, if any thing, has your relationship—when I say “your” I mean by it yours and your husband’s, been toward Major Milner in a general way?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question. Major Milner is not involved here.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I don’t know what it is all about, but I will take it.

A. I haven’t anything to conceal.

Mr. Gladstein: What? [1352]

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Presiding Inspector: She says she hasn't anything to conceal. Go ahead.

A. Major Milner is also a member of the Portland Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, and during the past two years our relationship has varied. I believe a two-year period covers it. In fact, there has been considerable of a variety of relationship between us during our association.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Within the past two years you have said that your relationship varied. Would you indicate a little more specifically what you meant by that?

A. Prior to my husband's repudiation of the Communist Party there was considerable strain and antagonism, I believe, between Major Milner and my husband and myself. After my husband's repudiation of the Communist Party, particularly after the Communist Party took the position which it did relative to the Moscow-Berlin non-aggression pact relative to the Finnish situation, relative to various other issues, my husband joined the American Legion, Post No. 1, Portland. He was invited to join.

After that Major Milner on occasion drove my husband home from the Post meetings. Occasionally he would drop in after he drove him home.

Since my husband's illness and death Major Milner and his wife have both been very kind and very loyal. [1353]

Q. During the past two years in which there existed this relationship that you have just de-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

scribed, Mrs. Lovelace, with Major Milner, can you state whether or not your husband gave information of any kind to Major Milner concerning Union activities?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question—
Union activities.

Presiding Inspector: If she knows. She can say "yes" or "no" if she knows.

A. No. My husband did not. In fact, Major Milner never suggested that he was seeking information relative to Union activities. In fact, it is my belief that Major Milner is not interested at the present time in Union or Communist or any other activities.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Would you say that the two of them did not discuss either Union activities or what we shall term Communist activities during the past two years to your knowledge?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question. The witness has already answered the question.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. I will hear it.

A. To say that we have not discussed such matters would be stupid.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q: You mean by that that you discussed—

[1354]

A. (Interposing): Communist activities, the position of the Unions relative to defense activi-

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

ties in a general way, just as the information which one reads in the newspapers, and which is a part of the life of every American.

Q. You mean your discussions have only been—— A. (Interposing): General.

Q. In a general way?

A. Yes; casual, the same as one discusses it with one's barber.

Q. What is the last time that your husband was a Union member?

A. I believe when he resigned from the Workers Alliance, if that could be called a Union.

Q. Would you date that, please?

A. It was about two years ago when he went to the hospital, when he had to resign from the Project because of going to the hospital; two years ago about now, I believe it was.

Q. And have you been a Union member?

A. Yes. I was a member of the Workers Alliance. I believe I paid one month's dues.

Q. Any other organization?

A. I have been a member of the American Newspaper Guild.

Q. During what period? [1355]

A. During, and for a brief time, for a short time, after my activities with the Voice of Action I was instructed to join the American Newspaper Guild by Lowell Wakefield, and other Communists under whose direction I worked.

Q. Would you date that, please?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. I don't know as I could recall the exact date. I believe it was in the Fall of 1935.

Q. For how long did you remain a member?

A. Seven or eight months; I believe my book had dues stamps for seven or eight months.

Q. Thereafter—

A. (Interposing): I simply dropped out. It was pointless for me to belong; and, furthermore, I thought it was injurious to the Union for people of my record to continue, particularly, a pointless affiliation with what could otherwise be a splendid Union.

Q. I asked you a few moments ago whether you knew Mr. Bonham or Mr. Norene, and you have already stated you did not. I did not ask you, but I would like to do so now, whether to your knowledge your husband was acquainted with Mr. Bonham?

A. I don't believe he was. I have never heard him mention Mr. Bonham except as a newspaper personality. [1356]

Q. How about Mr. Norene?

A. I don't believe he knew Mr. Norene either. I am quite sure that he knew neither.

Q. Last Friday, Mrs. Lovelace, the name of Frank Foss was mentioned. Do you recall in what connection?

A. Yes, it was mentioned in connection with a very pointless and meaningless, casual coffee shop, oh, encounter.

Q. Your husband knew Mr. Foss, of course?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. Yes. He knew him in relationship with democratic activities in the democratic party.

Q. Would you say that he knew him well?

A. I don't know what you mean by "well". No, we weren't socially close or socially related.

Q. Was the relation between them friendly?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. How about the relationship at the present time; that is to say, are you and Mr. Foss friendly?

A. Casually. Since my husband's death Mr. Foss has dropped over to the apartment once, which was perfectly natural under the circumstances.

Q. Are you acquainted with John L. Leach?

A. Not at all. I have read his name in the newspapers but that's all.

Q. Do you know whether your husband was acquainted with him?

A. I'm quite sure he wasn't. [1357]

Mr. Gladstein: I think that is all, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: That is all. You don't want to ask for anything?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just one question, if your Honor please.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Gladstein here had asked you regarding your relations with Captain Keegan, Brown, O'Dale and Lieutenant Mumpower,—is that the name?

A. Mumpower, I believe it is.

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

Q. And Bacon. Did any of these gentlemen contact you recently here regarding your testimony that you would give on the stand?

A. Certainly not.

Q. I mean the officers that I named?

A. No, they have not. And I would——

Q. (Interposing) In any event——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Wait a minute! The witness wants to say something.

A. (Continuing). If it wouldn't be injecting something, I would like to make it clear right now that the only instructions or suggestions that I have received relative to my testimony has come from the Federal Bureau of Investigation Officers and the gentleman who served the subpoena, and the instructions [1358] were only to tell the truth.

Presiding Inspector: Well, that was what you testified to to some extent on Friday?

The Witness: I believe so. And I wanted to emphasize it.

Q. You made a remark here in reply to one of Counsel's questions regarding the Workers Alliance, as to whether or not you consider that a union. Do you consider the Workers Alliance a union? A. A union?

Q. Yes.

A. No, I do not. I don't consider it a union because I believe that its union status has been purely formal and rather fictional.

Q. The Workers Alliance is affiliated with the Communist Party, is it not?

(Testimony of Dawn Lovelace.)

A. ~~No, it is one of the~~ "affiliated" is hardly the word. I believe it is a very flimsy front organization.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

Mr. Gladstein: No questions.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

Mr. Del Guercio: May the witness be excused, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, you are excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I don't know [1359] whether I could make this remark or not, but we have held this witness over the weekend here for what appears to me a useless purpose.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, I can't say about that, and I don't know that it makes any difference. I held the witness. I will take full responsibility.

Mr. Del Guercio: We are calling the next witness.

NAT HONIG

called as a witness for the Government, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Will you state your name, please?

A. Yes. Nat Honig; N-a-t H-o-n-i-g.

Q. And where do you reside?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Seattle, Washington.

Q. What is your present employment?

A. I am a newspaper man at the Post-Intelligencer, Seattle.

Q. Are you employed full time?

A. Part time.

Q. What do you do? A. Copy reader.

Q. Copy reader. How long have you been employed in that capacity? [1360]

A. For the past three years.

Q. Have you ever been a member of any labor organization?

A. I am a member of the American Newspaper Guild and I have been since 1936.

Q. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. When did you join the Communist Party?

A. In November, 1927.

Q. And under what name?

A. Under my name; Nat Honig.

Q. And how long did you remain a member of the Communist Party?

A. Until November, 1939.

Q. And what happened then?

A. I left the Communist Party.

Q. And you joined the Communist Party in New York. Did you remain there for any length of time thereafter?

A. Yes. I joined in 1927 and remained in the Communist Party in New York until May 1, 1934.

Q. Then where did you go?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Then I went to the Soviet Union.

Q. Who sent you to the Soviet Union?

A. The Communist Party.

Q. In what capacity?

A. Originally I was sent there as what they call a [1361] "Referant" to work in the Red International of Labor Unions. The duties of a Referant were to collect data, to furnish data to the Red International of Labor Unions on the American Trade Union movement.

Q. Trade Union movement? In the American Trade Union movement? A. Yes.

Q. And who paid your expenses?

A. The Communist Party of the United States.

Q. Who in the Communist Party gave you instructions to proceed to the Soviet Union?

A. What is that?

Q. Who in the Communist Party gave you instructions to proceed to the Soviet Union?

A. Well, it was a decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and actually the instructions came from Earl Browder.

Q. And how long did you remain in the Soviet Union as such?

A. Well, I arrived there approximately June 1, 1934 and remained—left there September 1, 1935.

Q. During the time that you were in Moscow did you continue your duties as a Referant?

A. I did for about three or four months and then I [1362] became the representative—the offi-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

cial representative of the American Communist Party to the Red International of Labor Unions.

Q. Who made you the official representative of the Communist Party of the United States?

A. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. And it was communicated to you in what manner?

A. It was communicated to the officials of the Red International of Labor Unions and they, in turn, informed me.

Q. And as such what did you do?

A. As such it was my task there to assist in formulating policies to be carried out by the Communist Party of the United States in its trade union work and to meet with representatives from other Communist Parties from other countries both in the Communist International and in the Red International of Labor Unions; exchange experiences of the various trade union movements so that, for instance, say, from the experiences of the German trade union—the Party in the trade unions in Germany, we could get information on how to do our work in the American Communist Party.

Q. How was this done; that is, did you attend meetings?

A. Yes; mainly by attending meetings.

Q. Now, what kind of meetings were they and who were [1363] in attendance?

A. They were meetings of, of course, first, the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

officials of the Red International of Labor Unions, representatives of the Communist Party, International itself and the different representatives of the various Communist Parties from different countries.

Q. Now, you speak of the "Red International of Labor Unions". What is that?

A. The Red International of Labor Unions—I don't believe it exists now, but at that time it was the world center for coordinating the work of the various Communist Parties in the trade union field. It was located in Moscow.

Q. And what was its relation or connection, if any, with the Communist International?

A. It was a section of the Communist International.

Q. Well, was it controlled and dominated by the Communist International?

A. It was controlled by it, because whatever decisions were arrived at in the Red International of Labor Unions—that is, major decisions, decisions of importance—had to be O.K.'d by the Communist International.

Q. Where did you attend these meetings?

A. Well, some of them, of course, were in the headquarters of the Red International of Labor Unions. The address of that in Moscow was in a building called the "Palace of Labor", and others were held in the Comintern Building itself. [1364]

Q. Where was that?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. That was located on a street called Mok-havaia.

Q. How do you spell it?

A. M-o-k-h-a-v-a-i-a.

Q. How often would you attend these meetings at Moscow?

A. Well, the Red International of Labor Union meetings were held at least once a week. It was a regular practice to hold them at least once a week. Then when anything special came up, say, of an emergency nature in regard to a particularly important situation in the United States, they would be held more often. Meetings with the Communist International of we who were representatives of the R. I. L. U.—I will use those initials for "Red International of Labor Unions"—these meetings were held usually about twice a month.

Q. And you say that you remained in Moscow for how long a period?

A. Well, it was from June 1, 1934 to September 1, 1935. I guess that's about 15 or 16 months.

Q. And then you returned to the United States?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you do upon your return to the United States?

A. Well, for a short time I worked in the District apparatus of the Communist Party in New York City. That's just while waiting for my next actual assignment. Then I was sent to work on the Western Worker in San Francisco here, which was

7

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

[1365] the official organ of the Communist Party for the Pacific Coast.

Q. Had you ever been on the staff of the Daily Worker in New York?

A. Yes, before—shortly after I joined the Communist Party in 1927 I assisted on the Daily Worker. I did reportorial work, make-up work, and various other duties.

Q. And then you say you came to the West Coast in connection with your work on the Western Worker?

A. Yes. I came specifically to work on the Western Worker.

Q. And what position did you hold on that paper?

A. When I first came I was Labor Editor, which means being in charge of all trade union news, all industrial news and so forth. Somewhat later I was made Managing Editor.

Q. Managing Editor of the Western Worker?

A. Of the Western Worker.

Q. And where was that paper published at that time?

A. At 121 Haight Street, San Francisco.

Q. And do you know whether that place was the headquarters of the Communist Party at that time?

A. It was.

Q. It was? A. Yes. [1366]

Q. I believe you testified that the Western Worker was the western organ of the Communist Party?

A. For the Pacific Coast, yes, sir.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Was it owned and controlled by the Communist Party?

A. It was. I don't know actually what the—I forget now officially what the name is that was used for the publishing company, that was on the masthead, but actually it was an organ of the Communist Party.

Q. Did you write any pamphlets or books for the Communist Party?

A. Yes. I wrote three of them—two of them and then I assisted in writing a third one.

Q. You say you wrote three of them?

A. I wrote two and then I collaborated in writing a third.

Q. With whom did you collaborate?

A. With William Z. Foster.

Q. Who is he?

A. At the time I wrote the pamphlet he was the national secretary of the Trade Union Unity League, and a member of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party.

Q. What was the first book you wrote?

A. I wrote two of them simultaneously and one was called "The Trade Union Unity League, Its Program, Policy and [1367] Structure"—words to that effect.

The other was called the "Trade Unions Under the NRA."

That might not be the exact title, but that was what it was in essence.

Q. Were you instructed to write these books?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes, I was.

Q. By whom?

A. By the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: In this country?

The Witness: In the USA; yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Where were you when you wrote these?

A. In New York City.

Q. When?

A. I think it was in 1934; a few months, I believe, before I left for the Soviet Union. Perhaps it was late in 1933.

Q. And before the books were published were they edited by anyone? A. Yes, they were.

Q. By whom?

A. They were edited by Mr. Foster for one, and then they were edited by a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, USA. I can't tell you exactly which member it was because it was the policy for any publication sponsored by the Party to be edited by some member of the Communist Party, and [1368] the author didn't particularly have to know which one edited it.

Q. Who published your book?

A. The Workers Library Publishers published both of these that I wrote.

Q. Did you submit them to the publishing house or to the Communist Party?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I submitted them to the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. How about the third book?

A. The third book was called "Industrial Unionism." That was published in, I believe, January, 1935, or very early in 1935, by the same concern. It was written in collaboration with Foster.

Presiding Inspector: Where were you at that time?

The Witness: In New York.

Presiding Inspector: I don't remember the date. Was this before or after you had been in Moscow?

The Witness. This third book was after I had returned home.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you a book called "The Trade Union Unity League, affiliated to R.I.L.U., its Program, Structure, Methods and History," published by the Trade Union Unity League, 2 West 15th Street, New York, and ask you if you can identify that [1369] book?

A. (Examining book) Yes, I can identify it.

Q. Is that the book you wrote?

A. No, this was an earlier book. The one I wrote had the same title. It is mentioned in Foster's autobiography as being written by myself and Foster.

But this book was considered out of date and it was considered necessary by the Central Committee of the Party to write a new one, bring the program

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

and policies of the Trade Union Unity League up to date:

This new one was the one that I wrote..

Q. Is that why you wrote a new book because of—withdraw that. Are you familiar with this?

A. Yes, I am familiar with this because I used it, as a matter of fact, for a lot of source material for the one I wrote.

Q. Would you say you used that information as authority on some matters?

A. Very much so, on very many matters.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this book in evidence, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The booklet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 220.)

By Mr. Del Guercio: [1370]

Q. Was this book published and distributed by the Communist Party?

A. This book was—I think this was published before my time. I am not sure; it is quite an old book. I don't remember just who it is published by.

Q. It says that it is published by the Trade Union Unity League.

A. Yes. This book was published by the Trade Union Unity League, 2 West 15th Street, itself, and not by the Communist controlled Workers Library Publishers, Inc.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Was the Trade Union Unity League controlled by the Communist Party?

A. Yes; completely.

Q. Could a writer publish any book without getting the consent of the Communist Party?

A. I can only state as to that, during the time that I was associated with the Trade Union Unity League as editor of "Labor Unity," no pamphlet or book could be published by the Trade Union Unity League until it was O. K.'d and edited by the Communist Party.

This particular book, I think, was published before I became editor of Labor Unity.

Q. Do you know about when it was published?

A. I think that was published, perhaps, in 1930; I wouldn't say definitely, though. [1371].

Q. Do you know when the Trade Union Unity League came into existence?

A. Yes; in 1929.

Q. And as a result of what, if you know?

A. Well, in the first place it was officially organized at a convention in Cleveland and the month, I think, was September or October—I wouldn't swear which—in 1929.

Do you want to know as to what purpose was behind this organization?

Q. Yes. Who called it and—

A. (Interposing) Oh yes. The decision to have that convention in the form of the Trade Union Unity League was made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, at the suggestion of the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Red International of Labor Unions, in Moscow, and the Communist Party, Central Committee, then informed the Executive Committee of the Trade Union Educational League, which was the predecessor of the Trade Union Unity League, that this convention in Cleveland was to be held for the purpose of forming a new trade union central organization, the Trade Union Unity League, or TUUL.

Q. Who attended this convention, if you know?

A. The convention was attended—I was not present at the convention and I can say who attended only from my knowledge as a member of the Daily Worker staff at the time, because I did handle labor news on the Daily Worker also. The [1372] convention was attended by the entire Executive Committee of the Trade Union Educational League, and among them were William Z. Foster, Jack Johnstone, William F. Dunn, and, I believe, Clarence Hathaway—I wouldn't say definitely as to that but I am pretty certain—and also Ben Gold, who was a leader of the Communist Party work in the Needle Trades Union.

Of course, in mentioning who attended this convention—

Q. (Interposing) I don't expect you to remember all of them.

A. You see, I am not talking as one who was present in mentioning them.

Q. The people that you have mentioned, they were what, so-called high functionaries in the Communist Party?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. The ones I mentioned, with the exception of Foster and Dunne, the others, and Johnstone, the others were officials or leaders in Trade Unions actually. Foster, Dunne, Hathaway, Johnstone, were officials in the Communist Party.

Q. And when you say "officials in the trade unions," do you mean that they were Communist Party member officials of trade unions?

A. They were officials in the trade unions who, at the same time, were members of the Communist Party, USA.

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to read a few excerpts from this book here to show the nature of the trade unions.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. [1373]

Mr. Del Guercio: Reading at the bottom of page 28.

"Revolutionary Goal.

"The new unionism sets itself a revolutionary goal. It points out the disaster of the capitalists owning the industries and operating them for their own profit. It advocates that only by overthrow of the present system of capitalist ownership and exploitation and the establishment of a working class society in which production will be carried on, not for private profit, but for the social good, —can the workers improve their conditions and emancipate themselves. The American working class must follow the path beaten out by the Russian workers. Capitalism cannot furnish an improved standard of living for the workers. The

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

workers have nothing to expect from capitalism but low wages, long hours, unemployment, speed-up, gradual worsening conditions, and war. They must aim at its overthrow.

"The capitalist system is doomed. It cannot overcome its own inherent contradictions. The disparity between the mounting capitalist production of commodities and the growing inability of the markets under capitalism to absorb them, makes eventually for the shut-down of industry, mass unemployment, sharper and sharper economic crises, greater and greater class struggles, devastating world wars, and the eventual mobilization of the working class for the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system."

And again on page 31: [1374]

"For the New Labor Union Center: The T.U.U.L.

"The national center of the revolutionary industrial movement in the United States is the Trade Union Unity League, organized in Cleveland, August 31st, 1929. The T.U.U.L. coordinates and binds all the revolutionary union forces into one united organization. It leads and directs the general struggle of the new union movement. It is the American section of the Red International of Labor Unions."

And again on page 35:

"Against Imperialist War and for Defense of the Soviet Union.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"The Trade Union Unity League fights militantly against the impending capitalist war and for the defense of the Soviet Union. Its slogan is: 'Not a man, not a cent, not a gun for Imperialist War.' It seeks to mobilize the great masses of workers against war by organizing strikes, demonstrations, etc., in conjunction with all militant organizations fighting against war. In the event of an Imperialist War it will mobilize the workers to struggle against American imperialism and to transform this war into a class war against the capitalist system itself."

And at the bottom of page 45:

"The T.U.U.L. affiliates itself with the Red International of Labor Unions. It joins hands with the militant workers of the World for international trade union unity. Under the leadership of the R.I.L.U., it takes its place, shoulder to shoulder [1375] with the revolutionary workers in the Soviet Union, in China, in Europe, in all countries in the world proletarian struggle against imperialism."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, I will show you a pamphlet called "The Trade Union Unity League Today, its Structure, Policy, Program and Growth," by Nathaniel Honig. Is that the book you wrote?

A. (Examining book) Yes.

Q. Under instructions of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that published by the Communist Party?

A. That was published by the Workers Library

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Publishers, I believe, and that was the official publishing house of the Communist Party.

Q. Was this pamphlet distributed by the Communist Party?

A. It was distributed at Communist Party Units, in the Communist Party Fractions,—Fractions are Communist Party groups within the trade unions—and Communist Party book stores.

Q. Does this contain the accepted policies, doctrines and practices of the Communist Party in connection with trade union matters?

A. Yes, it does. It was officially O.K.'d by the Central Committee of the Communist Party before it could be [1376].published.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this pamphlet in evidence, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 221.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to read several passages from this pamphlet, if your Honor please.

On page 12, at the bottom of page 12:

"The Trade Union Unity League fights militantly against the imperialist war plans, and pledges the utmost struggle in defense of the Soviet Union, the beacon-light for workers in all countries. It not only participates in demonstrative actions against imperialist war, but its policy is to build the anti-war base in the factories, especially in those industries which are war industries."

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Then further, on page 13:

"The Trade Union Unity League is not a political organization. It leads the economic struggles of the workers. But it is based on the policy of class against class, and T.U.U.L. unions have come out in support of the revolutionary political class struggles led by the Communist Party, because this Party believes in the class struggle."

And again on page 14.

"The T.U.U.L. points out to the workers the disaster of [1377] the capitalists owning the industries and operating them for their own profits. It leads the workers for their economic demands; but points out to them that only by the overthrow of the capitalist system of exploitation of the workers and by the establishment of a system, where production will be carried on not for private profit but for the social good, will the American workers, and workers in all capitalist countries, completely and finally free themselves from low wages, unemployment, long hours, the speed-up, lowering of conditions in all ways, and war. In Germany and Austria the futility of trying to overthrow the system of exploitation of the workers merely through parliamentary means has been shown."

And again on the last page:

"The perspective of the Trade Union Unity League is for increasing strike struggles."

And then skipping a few lines:

"The rising movement for independent unions

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

must receive the serious attention of the T.U.U.L.; a flexible policy must be adopted towards the building of these unions; the policy of unity with them is paramount. These policies will lead to a powerful revolutionary trade union movement." [1378]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, I will show you another book entitled "The Trade Unions Since the NRA", by "Nat Honig", and ask you if that is one of the books you wrote? A. Yes.

Q. And was this also distributed and circulated by the Communist Party?

A. Yes, it was. It was sold in the Communist Party book stores to the Communist Party units and so forth.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received.

(The book referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 222.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you a pamphlet here called "The Little Red Library, No. 1, Trade Unions in America" by W. Z. Foster, J. P. Cannon and E. R. Browder, published by the Trade Union Educational League, by the Daily Worker Publishing Company, 1113 West Washington Boulevard, Chicago, and ask you if you can identify that booklet?

A. I can identify it. Although it was published before I became a member of the Communist Party,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

it continued to circulate for a few months after I was a member and then it was withdrawn because J. P. Cannon had been expelled from the [1379] Party for differences with the Party. He had been expelled, and, therefore, it was withdrawn.

Q. But you say it was circulated by the Communist Party and found its way into Party channels.

Q. And does it contain in its pages the practices, policies and aims of the Communist Party in connection with trade unions matters?

A. Up to the time it was circulated and during the time.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 223.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You testified that you were made Editor-in-Chief, I believe, of the Labor Unity Magazine?

A. Yes.

Q. Is this a copy of the Labor Unity Magazine?

A. Yes, that is.

Q. Do you recognize that particular issue?

A. Yes.

Q. On the back of the cover of this book appears this: "Voice of militant labor, labor unity, published monthly by the Trade Union Unity League, Wm. Z. Foster, Secretary". [1380]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes sir, he was.

Q. Is that the William Z. Foster who was at the head of the Communist Party at one time?

A. He was National Chairman of the Communist Party, yes; not at that particular time. Later he was. He had other titles then.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received.

(The magazine referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 224.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a short recess?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, certainly.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May I proceed?

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, I show you the May, 1934 issue of the Communist Magazine, and ask you if you are familiar with this particular issue?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Do you know that this is the official magazine of the Communist Party?

A. It is the official theoretical organ of the Communist Party. [1381]

Q. Published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this in evidence, your Honor, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

(Testimony of Nat Henig.)

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The magazine referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 225.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to read from the bottom of page 467 of this book:

"Tasks of the Party in the trade-union work.

"1(a) Mobilize the entire Party membership for revolutionary trade-union work; (b) for the carrying through of the program of concentration to root the Party in the most important factories, establish trade union organization, for the building of the oppositions in the first place in the most important industries, stimulate, develop and lead the struggle of the workers. Enroll every Party member eligible into the trade unions on the basis of a thorough enlightenment of the membership as to reasons for our emphasis on work in the factories and trade unions. This was fully explained in the Open Letter, which stated that unless the Party established its roots among the decisive sections of the industrial proletariat it cannot become a mass Communist Party. The discussion must be brought into every Party nucleus, into every trade-union [1382] fraction. The Party leadership must not only convince the Party as to the correctness and urgency of carrying through the Open Letter, but also help the membership to carry through the tasks. Every district, section, nucleus, and especially shop nucleus, must work out its plan of work on the basis of the policy of concentration, assign the most ex-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

perienced and developed comrades for leadership in the trade-union work. Steps are to be taken to build the trained trade-union fractions and assure their guidance through the Party Committee. The Central Committee, the District Committee and all leading Party Organizations must assume responsibilities for the carrying through of these tasks and the work in the trade unions which is the task of the entire Party. In raising before the Party work in factories and trade-unions as the central task, care must be taken to overcome the opportunist conception of trade-union work. Our trade-union work is not an end in itself—the trade unions are for the Communists a bridge to the masses. As part of our Communist work in the factories, the Party nuclei in the factories must receive the greatest attention from the leading committees. They must receive the greatest guidance and support in building the union in the shop, the shop committee, the publication of a Party factory paper, building the circulation of the Daily Worker, recruiting into the Party.”

By Mr. Del Guercio: [1383]

Q. Is that the policy of the Communist Party regarding trade union work, what I have just read?

A. It was at that time.

Q. At that time, that it was just a bridge, not an end in itself; is that correct? A. Yes.

Q. And that is the policy of the Communist Party with relation to trade union matters as you understood it at that time?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. It was, yes. It was in all that period that I was a member of the Communist Party.

Q. And you were a member of the Communist Party from 1929——

A. (Interposing). '27.

Q. '27 to 1939? A. '39, yes.

Q. I will show you a pamphlet here called "The Platform of Struggle for Urgent Needs of Toilers, Election Platform of the Communist Party, New York State, 1934," issued by the Election Campaign Committee, Communist Party, New York State, 799 Broadway, N. Y. C., and ask you if you are familiar with this pamphlet?

A. Yes, I recognize it.

Q. Was that distributed and circulated by the Communist Party? [1384]

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, your Honor, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 226.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Distributed during the time you were a member of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. And during the time it was published?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to read just one small paragraph here appearing on page 8 of this pamphlet:

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"The first acts of a revolutionary workers' Government would be to open up the warehouses and distribute among all the working people the enormous surplus of stores of food and clothing."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you another issue of "The Communist" for May, 1938, and ask you if you are familiar with that particular issue?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. And this was published by the Communist Party of the United States?

A. Yes. [1385]

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this book in evidence, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received without objection.

(The book referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 227.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to call the Court's attention, please, to what appears on the back of the cover of this magazine. Among other things, the following appears:

"Read more about Marxism and Leninism, in hundreds of books, pamphlets and magazines for sale at these book stores and literature distributing centers".

Below that appears, among other addresses, this:
"San Francisco: 170 Golden Gate Avenue; 1609 O'Farrell Street; 121 Haight Street; 15 Embarcadero."

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you two other booklets, Mr. Honig. One is entitled "15 Years of the Communist International", and the other "Organizational Problems of the Communist Party" by A. A. Zhdanov, the second one published by the Workers Library Publishers, and I will ask you if you are familiar with these two booklets?

A. Yes. This "15 Years of Communist International" has no publishing date, and I believe it was published in [1386] 1935; about that time anyway. The other one I am familiar with.

Q. Were both of these booklets circulated and distributed by the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. During the time you were a member of it?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer them in evidence in order shown the witness.

Presiding Inspector: They will be received.

(The booklets referred to were received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibits Nos. 228 and 229.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, I will show you what purports to be a membership book in the Communist Party of the U. S. A., section of the Communist International, membership book No. 2799, in the name of one N. Miller signed by Alex Noral, signature of the District Organizer, and the Party seal appear-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

ing thereon, and ask you if you are familiar with such membership books?

A. I don't know the person whose name appears therein. I never met him. But I do know—I can say this: That the membership book I myself possessed in the Communist Party was identical as far as its—

Q. (Interposing) Identical in every respect with regard [1387] to the printed matter thereon?

A. Yes. And membership books that I have handled myself as a member of the Communist Party units were identical.

Q. Can you state, then, of your own knowledge that this book was an official membership of the Communist Party during that period of time?

A. Well, in every appearance it seems to me to be.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer it in evidence, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received.

(The membership book referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 230.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I ask that a photostatic copy be substituted therefor.

Presiding Inspector: It may be done. [1388]

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to read a few portions from pages of his membership book appearing on the printed portion of it. On page 14 there appears this:

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"The discussion on basic Party questions or general Party lines can be carried on by the members only until the Central Committee has decided them. After a decision has been adopted at the Congress of the Comintern, the Party convention, or by the leading Party Committee, it must be carried out unconditionally, even if some of the members or some of the local organizations are not in agreement with the decision."

And then again on an un-numbered page, the third page from the back under "Party Discipline" this appears:

"1. The strictest Party discipline is the most solemn duty of all Party members and all Party organizations. The decisions of the CI and the Party convention, of the CC and of all leading committees of the Party, must be promptly carried out. Discussion of questions over which there have been differences must not continue after the decision has been made."

Presiding Inspector: The date of that membership card?

Mr. Del Guercio: 1938, I believe.

The Witness: 1933, 1934, I believe it was.

Mr. Del Guercio: 1932—just a minute.

Presiding Inspector: The same kind has been used during the entire time you were a member?

The Witness: No. [1389]

Mr. Del Guercio: This was issued on January 16, 1933.

Presiding Inspector: Some change has been made?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: Slight changes were made every few years in the printed matter and the cover changed color.

Presiding Inspector: Was there any change in substance?

The Witness: Not in essential substance; no.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, I will show you a book called "What is Communism", by Earl Browder, General Secretary, Communist Party of the USA, published by the Workers Library Publishers, and ask you if you are familiar with that book?

A. (Examining book) Yes.

Q. Have you read it? A. Yes, I have.

Q. And was it published, distributed and circulated during the time you were a member of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. What is the publication date?

A. Oh, I think it was in 1933, or 1934. There were several editions of it.

Q. This shows 1936, is that correct?

A. There were quite a few editions of it. Yes.

Q. Does this contain the accepted doctrines, practices and teachings of the Communist Party?

A. Yes. That was written by the Secretary of the [1390] Communist Party.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(Testimony of Nat Horig.)

(The book referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 231.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to read, if your Honor please, from page 129 of this book:

"If bourgeois property is to be maintained under the present conditions of capitalist crisis, then the ruling class says there must be the destruction of surplus goods and productive forces accompanied by the most brutal suppression of the suffering masses. If the productive forces and accumulated wealth of society are to be preserved and further developed, the property rights of the capitalists and the institutions by which they are maintained must be abolished, and the exploiting minority and its agents suppressed. Thus, some form of violence is unavoidable. There is no possible choice between violence and non-violence. The only choice is between the two sides of the class struggle."

Presiding Inspector: You heard that word, French word, bourgeois? (French pronunciation)

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: What do you understand is meant by "bourgeois"? [1391]

A. What the Communist Party means by it is the capitalist class; the upper section of the capitalist class.

Presiding Inspector: That would be the aristocracy, wouldn't it?

The Witness: Well, not in the real—

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Bourgeoisie were the people who conducted the French revolution?

The Witness: They were the people who laid the groundwork for the rise of the bourgeoisie as a class.

Presiding Inspector: They were the bourgeoisie themselves?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Now, is a man who works with his hands and saves his money, and buys his home, a member of the bourgeoisie?

The Witness: No; the Communist Party wouldn't classify him as such.

Presiding Inspector: Why not?

The Witness: A man who works with his hands—you mean works for somebody else?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: No; he would be called a member of the proletariat.

Presiding Inspector: Well, take a public official, who works with his head, the Mayor of a city, is he a member of the [1392] bourgeoisie?

The Witness: It depends on what else he did. If he is just a public official and made his living—

Presiding Inspector: He never did anything else but serve the state since he got out of high school.

The Witness: He would be considered a member of the petty bourgeoisie. These are the people who, according to the Communist definition, who possess some slight amount of property, who don't toil with their hands, in factories, mill or smelter, and in this case, he would be classified as a member of the white

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

collar class, which is lumped in with the petty bourgeoisie.

Presiding Inspector: They were to be destroyed too? .

The Witness: No. In their publications they don't say they are to be destroyed. They are to be won over in proletarian eyes.

Presiding Inspector: But the other bourgeoisie are not to be won over at all, they are to be destroyed?

The Witness: No. They are to be destroyed.

Presiding Inspector: What about a newspaper editor?

The Witness: It depends on what kind of a paper he edits.

Presiding Inspector: He does the same sort of work in either case.

The Witness: Well, if he edits the Peoples World he is not to be destroyed; he would probably be helping in the destruction. [1393]

Presiding Inspector: If he edits, say, the New York Tribune he is to be destroyed?

The Witness: He probably would be.

Presiding Inspector: And by "destroyed" you really mean it, don't you; that is, you mean this is to be a forcible revolution?

The Witness: If they caught up with him, yes; if they didn't skip the country in time to get away.

Presiding Inspector: You don't mean any theoretical, political success by parliamentary, democratic methods?

The Witness: No.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: That is out?

The Witness: That is not the final program.

Presiding Inspector: When this revolution is to come about, of course, it is to be determined by the Central authority?

The Witness: It is to be determined, first of all, by probably the Communist International in Moscow—not probably; there is no question it would be—and then the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States would be told that they considered the time ripe for a revolutionary situation, for a revolutionary uprising.

Presiding Inspector: Part of the direct action?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: That was so during all the time that you were in the Party? [1394]

The Witness: Yes; but they didn't scorn indirect action either.

Presiding Inspector: Do the best they could with it?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: I wanted to understand these words of large content.

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes, sir.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, I will show you another copy of The Communist, for July, 1929, and ask if you are familiar with this particular issue?

A. (Examining magazine) Yes. I looked at the contents to refresh myself to see if I remember the articles. I am familiar with it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. This was published, of course, as indicated on the cover here, by the Communist Party of the USA? A. Yes.

Q. And sold, of course, as a magazine?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The magazine referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 232.) [1395]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Has there ever been any question during the time you were a member of the Communist Party that The Communist Magazine was not what it purports to be, one of the organs of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.?

A. No; never any question about it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to read from page 357 and continuing on page 358 and 359 of this magazine:

"When Communists urge strikes and crippling of industry in time of war we are accused of trying to bring about the defeat of our own government. To that charge we plead guilty. That is precisely our aim. A government engaged in warfare is weaker than at other times in spite of the fact that its savage repressions make it appear strong to the superficial observer. At such a moment an organized drive to stop the production of war supplies, to cripple the transportation system may

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

result in creating such difficulties that the imperialist forces may be defeated.

"But it is not sufficient in our drive against imperialist war merely to concentrate upon the war industries. We must be able to reach the masses in the armed forces of the nation with revolutionary agitation and propaganda calculated to cause defections and mutiny in the ranks.

"We do not indulge in the social-democratic twaddle about disarmament. We will not tell the soldiers in the army to throw [1396] away their guns and run home. We tell them to hold their guns in their hands and use them against their own capitalist oppressors. When faced with an imperialist war as an accomplished fact we must be able to popularize definite revolutionary slogans among the armed forces. In case of a war between imperialist nations we raise the slogan of fraternization with the soldiers of the opposing army, refusal to obey commands of officers, mutinies, and other forms of disruptive work. In case of a war against the Soviet Union our main slogan will be different. We will then urge the soldiers in the imperialist armies to desert the army and with their guns and as much ammunition as they can get, go over to the side of the Red Army against the imperialistic forces.

"While the capitalists prepare for another imperialist war, we prepare to utilize the difficulties for capitalism arising out of such a war in order to initiate the next stage of the world revolution.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"We realize that such a conflict requires careful preparation under the leadership of a determined Bolshevik party. Turning an imperialist war between nations into a civil war against capitalism is not a simple matter, it is not a game for dilettantes to play. It requires the most highly developed revolutionary strategy and an ability to estimate the relative forces involved in the struggle as well as the precise moment for the launching of the insurrection. [1937]

"When a revolutionary situation is developing, as a result of war or from any other cause, the Party of the proletariat must lead a direct attack against the capitalist state. The slogans put forth must be of such a nature as to guide the movement in its development, which will take the form at first of mass strikes and armed demonstrations. In that stage there arises the question of arming of the working class and disarming the capitalist class. Finally the highest form of struggle is reached wherein it culminates in the general strike and a merging of large sections of the military forces and the workers for armed insurrection against the capitalist state power."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, has the Communist Party ever deviated from the doctrines and precepts outlined in the article that I have just read?

A. All the time that I was a member of it those aims were retained.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, you said that upon your return from the Soviet Union you were used by the Communist Party in trade union activities, is that a correct statement of what you said?

A. Not exactly. I said that prior to going to the Soviet Union—as a matter of fact, because I had done trade union work I was sent to the Soviet Union, because I had been Editor of Labor Unity, the Communist Party trade union magazine. On my return, for a short time, for a month or so, I [1398] worked in the District office, in the New York District of the Communist Party. Then a few months after that I was sent out to San Francisco to be a member of the staff of the Western Worker, which is the predecessor of the Peoples World.

Q. And then it was before you went to Russia that you were Editor-in-Chief of Labor Unity?

A. Yes.

Q. You testified, I believe, that the Trade Union Unity League was created or was conceived, rather, the idea of forming the Trade Union Unity League was conceived by the Communist International?

A. Yes.

Q. And the Communist Party in the United States was ordered to hold a convention in 1929?

A. Yes—not to hold a convention under the name of the Communist Party—but ordered to organize one.

Q. To organize one? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know why the Communist Inter-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

national wanted to form the Trade Union Unity League?

A. Yes, sir. The idea was this, briefly speaking: Prior to that the work of the Communist Party in trade unions had been concentrated in the American Federation of Labor Unions with the object of splitting them up, breaking them up, and this was best exemplified by William Z. Foster's famous phrase, "to bore from within." Also with the objective, of course, [1399] of recruiting Communist Party members within the American Federation of Labor.

But by 1929 the American Federation of Labor had expelled many, many Communist Party members and, unfortunately, I think many who weren't, but who perhaps were thought to be. But they had expelled many, many Communist Party members to the point that these Communists had no trade union organization for themselves, those who had been expelled. One reason for the formation of the T.U.U.L. was to find a trade union organization for the Communists who had been expelled from the A. F. of L. to belong to.

Another reason was that in many industries, such as the steel industry, and similar heavy industries, textile, the American Federation of Labor had not done any organization whatsoever. These were industries that the Communist Party wanted to gain a foothold in as they considered them very essential for the aims of the Communist Party in which to have a Communist nuclei. It could not

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

be done in the American Federation of Labor because the A. F. of L. had not organized in these industries to any extent, so the Communist Party wanted to set up unions in these fields, to have an organization through which to work for its aims in these particular unorganized industries.

Then, of course, I think the chief reason for the formation was that it was felt in Moscow, in the Communist Inter- [1400] national and in the Red International of Labor Unions, that a situation was rapidly occurring where the formation of unions with a direct revolutionary goal would be essential because, as you know, the Wall Street crash occurred in 1929, and unemployment started to increase, plants began to shut down, and they felt that now with this discontent, that this discontent would mount among the working class, and that was a good opportunity to form revolutionary unions to channelize that discontent. [1401]

Q. And they were not forming those unions as one of these exhibits you have just read indicates, "As a means in itself"?

A. No. They were formed with a definite revolutionary goal.

Q. And the Trade Union Unity League was what? What was its function and how did it operate? That is, what did it do?

A. The Trade Union Unity League was supposed to be an equivalent of the American Federation of Labor, a direct rival in the sense of the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. F. of L. being a central organization for all A. F. of L. international unions. In the same way the Communist Party hoped to make the Trade Union Unity League a national central trade organization to which "Red," as they were called—Red trade unions in each industry would be affiliated.

Q. Did it issue charters to the various—

A. (Interposing) It issued charters to unions which it had set up.

Q. What are some of the so-called unions that belong to the Trade Union Unity League?

A. There was National Textile Workers Union, National Miners Union, Marine Workers Industrial Union, Needle Trade [1402] Workers Industrial Union, Shoe and Leather Workers Industrial Union, Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union. I imagine those covered the main fields. National Miners Union—I don't know that I have mentioned that. Later on, the Auto Workers Union. That is not the present CIO Auto Workers Union, but that was a Red trade union.

Q. You mentioned the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. Yes.

Q. Is there a question of its being a Red union, as you stated?

A. Well, it was affiliated directly with the Trade Union Unity League, all of whose National Executive Board members were members of the Communist Party and in most cases members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. And in all the time that I worked as Editor of Labor

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Unity and, incidentally, as such I was a member of the National Executive Board of the TUUL—and all that time there were no leading officials, particularly no national leading officials of the Marine Workers Industrial Union who were not members of the Communist Party and generally leading members of the Communist Party.

Q. Oh, you were on the governing board of the TUUL?

A. Yes. As Editor of the Labor Unity under its constitution I was automatically a member of the National [1403] Executive Board.

Q. And how does this National Executive Board function with relation to the TUUL and the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. It was made up of all the national officers of the TUUL itself, of all the international presidents of the Red trade unions which had been set up, myself as Editor of the official organ, and a few other Communist Party members who were leading officials in these Red trade unions. It would meet generally at least once a week, consider the problems of each union or at least those unions that had any important problems that particular week, make decisions, then consult with members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on what decisions they made; and then, if it was O.K.'d by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, they were transmitted as decisions to be followed out absolutely by the various unions affiliated with the TUUL.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Why was it necessary to consult the officials of the Communist Party or Central Committee of the Communist Party?

A. It was the Trade Union Unity League had been set up in the first place by the Central Committee of the Communist Party for the chief purpose of carrying out Communist Party work, and the Communist Party aims among the workers.

Q. Would you say, then, that it was a creature of the Communist Party, the Trade Union Unity League? [1464]

A. Yes, of course, in the first place it was a creature of the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions.

Q. And it was completely dominated and controlled by the Communist Party?

A. There was never any doubt of that in my mind in all the time that I was closely connected with it.

Q. Was there any doubt in anybody else's mind; that is, who was on the Executive Board?

A. Not on the Executive Board, no.

Q. Was there any member of the Executive Board who was not a member of the Communist Party?

A. I cannot recall a single one, and I believe I knew every one of them in the period that I was Editor of the Labor Unity.

Q. Who were some of the members of the Executive Board?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. They were not necessarily at the same time members, but in the time that I was.

Q. Yes.

A. But they were also members of the Executive Board. Well, of course, there was William Z. Foster.

Q. There is no question about him being a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, because he ran openly as Communist Candidate for President of the United States several times. Then there was [1405] James W. Ford.

Q. Who was he?

A. He was the leader in Negro Communist Party work among the Negroes. He was a member of the National Executive Committee throughout the period that I was on it.

Q. Was there any question about his being a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, because he ran for Vice-Presidential Candidate of the United States.

Q. On the Communist ticket?

A. Yes. There was Jack Johnstone.

Q. Was there any question about his being a member of the Communist Party?

A. Not to me or to any of us other members of the Executive Board. We knew he was because we also met with him in district committee meetings. And a man by the name of John Schmies.

Q. How do you spell that?

A. S-c-h-m-i-e-s, who when I was Editor of Labor Unity was Assistant Secretary of the Trade

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Union Unity League and later was sent to Detroit to do work among the auto workers for the Communist Party, and who later on became District—I think even before that, and then again later became a district official for the Communist Party in the Detroit district. So [1406] there was no doubt about him and his political affiliation.

Then there was, Ben Gold who became President of the Needle Trade Workers Industrial Union which was set up as a TUUL Union. There was—

Q. (Interposing) Is there any question about his being a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, if memory serves we right, he too had run as a Communist Candidate in New York State or New York City elections. I don't remember exactly. There was a man named Potash. I don't remember his first name.

Q. Potash?

A. P-o-t-a-s-h. Who was one of the officials of the Needle Trade Workers Industrial Union, was a member of the Communist Party. I knew that, that he was.

Well, there was Frank Borich, who was President of the International Miners Union. B-o-r-i-c-h. And Ann Byrlak, who became President of the National Textile Workers Union, which was set up by the Trade Union Unity League.

Q. Is there any question about those two being members of the Communist Party?

A. No, no. When I say "there was no question", I mean among all of us who were members of

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

the National Executive Board of the TUUL. There were numerous others.

Q. But you have given the most important ones? [1407].

A. I think I have. I may have omitted some.

Q. Yes. Well, I will show you now a magazine here called "The Communist International", published by the Workers—no, "The Communist International, Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International," published by the "Workers Library Publishers, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D. New York City", the June 20, 1934 issue, and I will ask you if you are familiar with this particular publication? A. Yes, I am.

Q: And this magazine is, as indicated on the cover here, the organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, Your Honor, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received without objection.

(The magazine referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 233.)

Mr. Del Guercio: And I would like to read from page 392 of this publication, as follows:

"In marine, while the Marine Workers' Industrial Union has led a number of successful strikes among the seamen, the opposition work among the longshoremen in the A. F. of L. is very weak, par-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

ticularly in the Atlantic and Gulf Ports. In the strike struggles on the Pacific Coast, it was possible, [1408] by combining opposition work in the A. F. of L. together with the independent activity of the Marine Workers Industrial Union and its correct approach to the united front, to exert some influence on the longshoremen's struggles in San Francisco, and to play an important role in spreading the strike to the seamen".

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you a magazine here called the "Party Organizer", dated August, 1931, issued by the Central Committee Communist Party, U.S.A., and ask you if you are familiar with this particular booklet? A. Yes, I am.

Q. And is it as it indicates issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

A. Yes.

Q. Distributed by them? A. Yes.

Q. Circulated by them? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this booklet in evidence, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The booklet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 234.) [1409]

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to call the Court's attention to the last page of this book. It is a dictionary of abbreviations for all of the abbreviations used.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Is this the abbreviations used for the various organizations connected or affiliated with the Communist Party?

A. Yes, they are. Some of them are organizations set up by the Communist Party but not openly Communist Party creations.

Mr. Del Guercio: And among those listed, if your Honor please, to which I would like to call the Court's attention, is the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, given the abbreviation "MWIU".

Presiding Inspector: Does that fall within the class you mentioned?

The Witness: Yes. You mean as organizations not supposed to be known openly as Communist?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. How about the ILD? A. The same.

Q. The International Labor Defense?

A. The International Labor Defense. [1410]

Presiding Inspector: But that is not so of the TUUL?

The Witness: Yes, that is openly as far as the membership of various TUUL Unions were concerned. They were not supposed to know, and many of them didn't know, that they were being controlled by the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: Didn't it in one of its books says, "affiliate" of the Red International?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: Yes. But the Red International of Labor Unions wasn't also openly advertised as a section of the Communist International?

Presiding Inspector: In Moscow?

The Witness: Yes, in Moscow.

Presiding Inspector: They had front institutions in Moscow, too?

The Witness: Oh, yes.

Presiding Inspector: What would be the reason for making it an affiliate of Moscow, a trade union institution, if it was not to be Communist?

The Witness: Well, naturally they wanted to set up the world center of the Red trade union work all over the world. They wanted to set it up as near as possible to the Communist International itself, so that decisions of the Communist International could be transmitted as rapidly as possible. Another reason was that it was extremely difficult for any international [1411] organization with the title "Red" in it or which is known or suspected of being a Communist International Organization to gain a haven in any other country but the Soviet Union. And I believe those are the two chief reasons.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. This William Z. Foster was the National Secretary of the Trade Union Unity League, was he not? A. Yes, he was.

Q. Did everybody know that he was a Communist?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes, because, as I mentioned, he had run as Presidential Candidate of the Communist Party.

Q. There was no effort, like there was in some of these other front organizations, to conceal the identity of the Trade Union Unity League, was there?

A. There was. There was lots of effort in that direction. The idea was that the Trade Union Unity League was to appear simply as an ordinary trade union central organization, just as the A. F. of L. was, and in the literature, however, circulated among party members themselves, among Communist Party members themselves, there was very little—there was a great deal of looseness in describing the TUUL. They would constantly couple up the name of the Communist Party with the Trade Union Unity League and they would refer to them as the "Red Trade Unions", and this became a regular habit. Then when anybody questioned that and would ask "Well, how is it you call them Red Trade [1412] Unions"? They would say, "Well, the term 'Red' simply means unions with simply a militant attitude and policy. It doesn't necessarily mean 'Communist'".

Q. But every member of the Communist Party knew the connections between these various unions, like Marine Workers Industrial Union, to the TUUL and it, in turn, with the Red International of Labor Unions, and in turn, with the Communist International?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Any member of the Communist Party who attended the meetings, or even once in a blue moon or read one Communist periodical once in a blue moon understood that.

Q. I will show you a pamphlet here called the "Party Organizer" for April, 1934, issued by the Central Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., and ask you if you are familiar with this particular pamphlet or magazine? A. Yes, I am.

Q. Was this, as the book indicates, as the pamphlet indicates, issued by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it distributed—

A. (Interposing) Yes.

Q. (Continuing) —by the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this in evidence, if your Honor please. [1413]

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 235.)

Mr. Del Guercio: And I would like to call the Court's attention particularly to pages 26, 27 and 28 of this pamphlet, an article by "X. Y., A Communist Soldier", "Work in the Armed Forces".

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you another issue—August, 1934,—of the "Party Organizer" and ask you if you are familiar with that? A. Yes, I am.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. And is that also issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.?

A. Yes.

Q. And distributed? A. Yes.

Q. And circulated by the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received without objection.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 236.) [1414]

Mr. Del Guercio: And I would like to read from page 1 of this booklet, your Honor, under the title "Two Lessons from the San Francisco General Strike", beginning with the third paragraph:

"The answer to this question is clear. The long-shoremen took the control of their strike from the hands of the labor bureaucracy and placed it in the hands of a rank-and-file leadership, which firmly resisted all of the efforts of the fakers and the Government to betray it. The masses in Toledo and Milwaukee and Minneapolis were in motion, the Party played a role in all of these strikes, the workers adopted our slogans and attempted to carry them out, but were defeated by the strategy and the tactics of the bosses and the bureaucrats. Why could this occur? Was it because the workers in Toledo and Milwaukee and Minneapolis were less militant.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

or less determined, than the longshoremen in San Francisco? No, the answer lies in the fact that in these places the Party was working from without. We did not have a firm base among the workers. But in San Francisco the Party had carried out a policy of concentration among the longshoremen, who are a decisive section of the working class, and had built a strong opposition movement within the reformist union. Consequently when the labor leaders appeared before the workers with their betrayal policy, there was a strong organized group within the union, which was able to expose their maneuvers and defeat [1415] them."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I show you another pamphlet here called "Out of a Job," by Earl Browder, "Order from Workers Library Publishers, Inc.," and ask you if you are familiar with this? A. Yes, I am.

Q. Is this pamphlet published, circulated and distributed by the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. During the time that you were a member?

A. Yes, it was.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, your Honor, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received without objection.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 237.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to read a para-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

graph from page 20 of this book under the heading "The Final Solution for Unemployment".

"From what has been said, it is clear that unemployment, which is the foundation upon which the capitalist class has built its entire system, can only be finally abolished by the abolition of capitalism. And capitalism can only be abolished [1416] by the working class, organizing its power in strong, fighting trade unions, under the leadership of the Communist Party, and overthrowing the state power of the capitalist class to replace it with the workers' government—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rule of the propertyless people".

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you three documents here, the first being the February, 1934 issue of "The Communist" published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States; the second one, a booklet called "The Way Out, a Program for American Labor, Manifesto and Principal Resolutions Adopted by the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. Published by the Workers Library Publishers, May, 1934"; and the third, a booklet called "Why a Worker's Daily Press?" by C. A. Hathaway and Sam Don, "Daily Worker, Central Organ Communist Party, U.S.A., Section of the Communist International", and ask you if you are familiar with these three documents?

A. Yes, I am. [1417]

Q. Referring to the first one, The Communist,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

for February, 1934, is it, as it is indicated, the publication of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.?

A. Yes.

Q. And distributed and circulated by the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. And are the other two documents published, distributed and circulated by the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer these three documents in evidence in the order shown the witness.

Presiding Inspector: They may be received.

(The three pamphlets referred to were received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibits 238, 239 and 240.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, I will show you a pamphlet here called "Little Brothers of the Big Labor Fak-ers," by Wm. Z. Foster, published by the Trade Union Unity League, 2 West 15th Street, New York, and ask you if you are familiar with that?

A. (Examining pamphlet) Yes, I am.

Q. Who distributed this pamphlet, if you know?

A. That was distributed through the Trade Union Unity League itself, and it was on sale at the Communist Party book stores—at least I know it was in the New York book stores of the Communist Party. It was sold at Communist Party [1418] units.

Q. Did the Communist Party distribute it, or assist in its distribution?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Assisted in its distribution.

Q. And was this, like the other pamphlets, edited by the high officials of the Communist Party before it was published?

A. Well, that probably didn't have to be because it was written by Foster himself, who was one of the high officials, so that I can't say definitely whether he had to submit it to anybody, but I doubt it.

Q. Was this made available to everybody that wanted to purchase it?

A. To every member of a Trade Union Unity League Union, or to every member of the Communist Party; yes.

Q. And also, you say, to every member of the particular trade union under the T.U.U.L.?

A. All unions under the T.U.U.L.; yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 241.)

Presiding Inspector: When was it published?

The Witness: 1931.

Mr. Del Guercio: It has a report of William Foster's [1419] speech made on May 16, 1931. It must have been published some time after that date. The pamphlet does not contain a publication date.

I would like to read from page 3 of this booklet:

"The Trade Union Unity League is the American Section of the Red International of Labor Unions. It is composed of industrial unions, organized min-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

orities in the reformist organizations and unemployed councils."

And further down on the same page:

"The T.U.U.L. is based on the class struggle."

And again on page 4:

"The T.U.U.L. is a revolutionary union; it fights for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a workers' and farmers' government. On its fight for partial demands, the T.U.U.L. bases its program of organization, education, and struggle of the workers for final emancipation.

"To broaden and intensify its general struggle, the T.U.U.L. makes united front movement with the Communist Party, with the workers in A. F. of L. unions and other proletarian organizations and with unorganized workers."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, you say this was made available to all these unions under the T.U.U.L.?

A. Yes.

Q. And to all members of it? [1420]

A. Yes. By "being made available" I mean, of course, it was distributed in the unions and there offered for sale to all members.

Q. Whether the members were members of the Communist Party or not?

A. Yes; in the case of T.U.U.L. unions, whether they were or not members of the Party.

Presiding Inspector: I notice there that parts of the reformist unions were admitted to membership. Would they be the Communist Fraction?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: By "reformist unions" they meant the American Federation of Labor unions.

Presiding Inspector: Would they be accepted into the T.U.U.L.?

The Witness: They wouldn't apply. They were very—

Presiding Inspector: What does that refer to?

The Witness: Reformist unions—to minorities, Communist minorities working within those reformist unions.

Presiding Inspector: It isn't mentioned in quite that way.

Mr. Del Guercio: They put it this way:

"to broaden and intensify its general struggle, the T.U.U.L. makes united front movements with the Communist Party; with the workers in A. F. of L. unions and other proletarian organizations, and with unorganized workers." [1421]

Presiding Inspector: But the membership, what does it say that consists of? You read it a few moments ago.

Mr. Del Guercio: From this same book?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: It says here:

"The T.U.U.L. is based on the class struggle. It opposes the whole class collaboration line of the American Federation of Labor, including union-management-cooperation, arbitration, the no-strike policy, support of the capitalist parties, etc."

Presiding Inspector: Let me see that pamphlet, please. That isn't what I referred to.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

(Government's Exhibit No. 241 was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Presiding Inspector: In the very first sentence it says:

"The Trade Union Unity League is the American Section of the Red International of Labor Unions."

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: The second sentence reads:

"It is composed of industrial unions, organized minorities in the reformist organizations and un-employed councils."

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: What does it mean by "organized minorities in the reformist organizations?" [1422]

The Witness: It means Communist Party members who still remain in certain A. F. of L. Unions to "bore from within."

Presiding Inspector: What other witnesses have called the Communist Fractions in those unions?

The Witness: Yes; they would be Communist Fractions in those Unions.

Presiding Inspector: I don't want to mislead you, if that isn't it.

The Witness: No, no; that is what it was.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you a pamphlet called "4 Fighting Years, a Short History of the Marine Workers Industrial Union," issued by the Marine Workers

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Industrial Union, 2 Stone Street, New York City, and on the back of this appears this:

"Where to join. Headquarters of M.W.I.U."

And, among other addresses, is given "San Francisco, California, Third Floor, 437 Market Street."

I will ask you if you can identify this?

A. (Examining pamphlet) Yes. I can't recall the date of publication of it, but I do definitely recall its circulation among Communist Party members.

Q. Who distributed, who caused its circulation and distribution?

A. Well, of course, it was published by the Marine Workers Industrial Union itself, and the Communist Party members [1423] of the Marine Workers Industrial Union would have it distributed among Communist Party members in other unions and Communist Party units themselves, and also would send a batch of them to each book store of the Communist Party.

Q. And they would be sold and distributed to these Communist Party book stores?

A. Yes. I have seen it in the New York Communist Party book stores.

Q. This article appears to be written by Roy B. Hudson, National Secretary? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Roy B. Hudson?

A. Yes. He is a member also—I should have mentioned him—of the National Executive Board of the Trade Union Unity League. He was National Secretary of the Marine Workers Industrial

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Union, either that or National President—I forget the exact title used—but he was the chief of it.

Q. Is there any question about him being a member of the Communist Party?

A. No; no because I knew him as a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this ⁽ⁱⁿ⁾ evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: Received: [1424]

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 242.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I show you a booklet called "The Point Gorda Strike," published by the Marine Workers Industrial Union, 140 Broad Street, New York City, and ask you if you are familiar with that booklet?

A. (Examining booklet) Yes. I am familiar with this because it is based on an article, the same title of which appeared in the Labor Unity, when I was made Editor of it. It is an elaboration on the same thing, made into a pamphlet.

Q. Who caused that booklet to be distributed?

A. It was decided by the Central Committee of the Communist Party that it would be a good idea to take this article, "The Point Gorda Strike," and

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

make a pamphlet out of it. It was suggested to the Trade Union Unity League executive board which, in turn, passed the suggestion on to the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and so it was done.

Q. So your testimony is that it was distributed, or caused to be distributed by the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received. [1425]

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 243.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like to call the Court's attention to the first page of this on which is contained the Marine Workers Industrial Union's preamble—I won't take the time to read it.

On the back of this, on the back cover under "Where to join, Headquarters of the M.W.I.U.", among other addresses, is shown "San Francisco, 78 Clay Street"

Presiding Inspector: We will recess until 2:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 P. M. a recess was taken until 2:00 o'clock P. M. of the same day.)

[1426]

After Recess

2:00 o'Clock P. M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio.

NAT HONIG

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Direct Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, I am going to hand you a certain number of Government Exhibits here, the first one being Government's Exhibit No. 114, and ask you to look at it and tell me if you can identify it.

A. (Examining exhibit) Yes; from the table of contents.

Q. Are you familiar with the International Press Correspondence? A. Yes.

Q. What is that?

A. It is a publication printed in several languages; which reports the news of Communist Parties, rather, not the news, but the progress, and growth of the Communist Parties in all countries.

The English edition, while I was in the Party, was published in London and I think in one period anyway it would be also reprinted in New York.

[1427]

Then there was a French edition a Chinese edition and a Spanish edition, published in the chief cities of each of these respective countries, except the Chinese edition, which, I think, was published in Moscow.

At that time there was an original Russian edition, which was translated into all these languages, but it was published in Moscow.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. And was it distributed the circulated during the time that you were in the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. I will show you Government's Exhibit No. 91 and ask you if you can identify that?

A. (Examining exhibit) Yes; this is the Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels. I am familiar with it. There were many other editions that were printed and published by the Communist Party.

Q. And was this circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you were in the Communist Party? A. Yes, it was.

Q. I will show you Government's Exhibit No. 92, "The Communist International", and ask you if you are familiar with it?

A. Yes, I am familiar with it.

Q. I believe that is "The Communist International" by V. I. Lenin? [1428] A. Yes.

Q. Was this book circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time you were in the Party?

A. Yes. It was published by the International Publishers, which was one of the publishing houses of the Communist Party.

Q. I will next show you Government's Exhibit No. 93, "The Function of the Communist International" by V. I. Lenin, and ask you if that book was distributed and circulated by the Communist Party during the time you were in the Party?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. I will next show you Government Exhibit 94, "Thesis and Statutes of the Communist International", and ask you if that book was distributed and circulated by the Communist Party during the time you were in the Communist Party?

A. No. This was published in 1920 or '21. It is the Thesis of a Congress held in 1920 and it was long before I was a member of the Communist Party. I have seen copies of it in possession of Communists. I haven't seen it distributed and sold by the Communist Party during my period of membership.

Q. Did you ever see it in the Communist Library or book shops, Communist bookshops?

A. No. I have merely seen it in the individual possession.

Q. In the possession of individual members of the Communist Party? [1429]

A. Yes.

Q. I show you Government's Exhibit 95, "Program of the Communist International", and ask you if that book was distributed and circulated by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member?

A. Yes, this was. This is familiar.

Q. I next show you Government's Exhibit 102, "Platform of the Class Struggle," and ask you if that book was distributed and circulated by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes; for a short time after I was, then it was withdrawn from circulation.

Q. I will show you Government's Exhibit 105,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

“Left Wing Communism”, by N. Lenin, and ask you if that was circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member?

A. I have never seen this particular edition of it. The same work, “Left Wing Communism” by Lenin, I have seen other editions published later on, but not this particular edition of it.

Q. Did it contain substantially the same matters contained in that book?

A. I can't tell because I haven't read this particular one. I can't tell.

Q. I will show you Government's Exhibit 106, “Imperialism [1430] and Imperialist War”, and ask you if that book was circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member?

A. Yes, this was.

Q. Next I will show you Government's Exhibit 107, “Struggle Against Imperialists and Tasks of the Communists”, and ask you if that book was circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member?

A. Yes, this was.

Q. Next, Government's Exhibit 101 “On the Road to Bolshevism”.

A. “Bolshevization”, yes.

Q. Was that book circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. And next I will show you Government's Exhibit 115, another copy of “The International Press Correspondence”, and ask you if the “International

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"Press Correspondence" was still in effect during the time that you were a member of the Communist Party and still printing such pamphlet?

A. Yes.

Q. Next, Government's Exhibit 116, "Why Every Worker Should Join the Communist Party". Was that pamphlet circulated and distributed by the Communist Party during the time that you [1431] were a member? A. Yes.

Q. The next one, Government's Exhibit 140, "Democracy or Fascism", and ask you if that booklet was distributed and circulated by the Communist Party during the time that you were a member? A. Yes, this was.

Q. And the last is "The Communist", August 16 issue, and ask you if you can identify that particular issue? A. Yes, I can.

Q. And that magazine contains the accepted doctrines, teachings and practices of the Communist Party for that period?

A. Yes; that was the official organ of the Communist Party.

Q. Now, in these books that you have identified, Mr. Honig, do they contain the accepted practices and teachings of the Communist Party during the period of time you were a member of that Party?

A. Yes; those that I have identified, do.

Q. Do you know, Mr. Honig, what the aims, objectives and purposes of the Communist Party were during the time that you were a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, I believe I do. [1432]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Do you also know what the teachings of the Communist Party were during that period of time?

A. Yes.

Q. What were the aims, objectives and teachings of the Communist Party during the period of time that you were a member of the Party?

A. The basic aim of the Communist Party of the United States, in the period that I was a member—I won't presume to place them in their order of importance necessarily, but as they come to me:

One was for the overthrow of the democratic system of Government, as we know it in the United States, and a substitution for that of a dictatorship of one party, the Communist Party.

Q. How were they to accomplish that end?

A. The accepted writings advocated, if necessary, that would be done by use of force and violence. In many of the writings it was stated that it was believed that it would be necessary to do so.

Q. Well, was there any doubt that force and violence would be used?

A. Well, it wasn't a question of whether there was any doubt; it was just, as far as the Communist Party leaders were concerned, I suppose—I don't suppose—I know from the discussions with them that they would prefer, if they [1433] could accomplish their aim without a hardship or difficulty they could avoid, they would prefer it that way naturally; if they couldn't, the teachings were to accomplish that aim by whatever means were necessary, or whatever means they thought necessary.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Including the use of force and violence?

A. Yes.

Q. What other objectives did they have?

A. That was their main and definite, and final objective..

Q. What was their objective regarding the trade unions?

A. Their objective regarding trade unions was either to utilize existing trade unions, such as the American Federation of Labor Unions, later on the CIO Unions when they came into being, or at various times to create unions in order to obtain a foothold in industries, particularly the basic industries, the heavy industries, such as steel, various mining industries, marine, textile, to obtain a foothold in these industries, and to set up nuclei groups of Communists in these industries to that when the time was considered right for a seizure of power by the Communist Party that they could already have the Communist Party groups in these industries, very active in these basic industries and, as a result, could move immediately to seize these industries. [1434]

Q. Are you familiar with the doctrine or practice of hypocrisy and deceit practiced by the Communist Party?

A. Well, in the various writings of accepted teachers of the Communist Party, such as Lenin and Stalin, and particularly in one book by Lenin, "Left Wing Communism"—I believe it is "Left Wing Communism"—I am practically certain of

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

that—it is definitely stated, set forth, what methods the Communists can and must use, if necessary to accomplish these aims.

I cannot give exact quotations—that is difficult to do—but it is stated there that Communists should not hesitate to resort to subterfuge, deception, and several more words meaning the same thing, to achieve these aims.

Q. Do they use trickery and terrorism to accomplish their aims?

A. From my experience in the Communist Party, for a long time very little of what you might call terrorism was used. Later on, I think—I don't think but I know—from my own experiences that terrorism not of a major scale or anything, but what I would call individual petty terrorism, was resorted to against those, particularly in unions who were hostile to the Communist aims.

Presiding Inspector: You are talking about this country?

The Witness: I am talking about this country all the time; yes. [1435]

Since I left the Communist Party, particularly in my experience, I can tell you, and I assure you I know, they have resorted to an attempt at terrorism against me myself in Seattle.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you know if the membership of the Communist Party were instructed as to how they should conduct themselves in Courts if they were ever called to testify in the Courts of this country?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. They would be told, when a Communist Party member was brought in Court in some case or other, they were told in certain cases it might be necessary to conceal, in many cases, conceal the fact that they were Communist Party members; except in cases where it was pretty well known that they were Communist Party members, they were generally to deny it. Such as, if a man might have run for some office, some public office on the Communist Party ticket, it would be very little use of him to deny in Court that he was a member of the Communist Party. But otherwise, generally, it was an accepted practice.

Q. You mean it was an accepted practice to deny membership in the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Even when asked under oath?

A. Yes. I would say it this way: That over a period of time that I was a member of the Communist Party that was the [1436] practice.

Q. And would they be instructed to falsely testify under oath regarding other matters touching the Communist Party?

A. I can't say that I ever heard any Communist being instructed to testify falsely under oath regarding other matters. I do know in many, many cases in Court of people, Communists that I knew, and from reading the testimony that they gave they did testify falsely, but I cannot say that they were instructed by the Communist Party to do that. I didn't hear such instructions given.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, do you know Harry Bridges?

A. Yes. I have met him at Communist Party meetings here in San Francisco.

Q. Now, do you know where he is? Do you see him here in the Court room?

A. Yes. Oh, yes.

Q. Where is he?

A. That's Harry Bridges (Indicating).

Q. Did you know him during the period of time that you were in the Communist Party?

A. I knew him—the major part of the period that I was on the Western Worker here I knew Harry Bridges.

Q. Is he a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Bridges?

A. He was a member of the Communist Party at all the period that I was here in San Francisco on the Western [1437] Worker.

Q. Was he a member of the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I can't state that he was from my own knowledge, that is, from seeing him in the Marine Industrial Workers Union, ~~because the Marine Industrial Workers Union had been abandoned by the Communist Party by the time I had arrived in San Francisco to work on the Western Worker.~~ But in leading Communist Party circles in the East, such as in the Trade Union Unity League, later on when he became known through the 1934 strike it was stated openly between the Commu-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

nist Party members and leading positions in the TUUL that Harry Bridges had been a member of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Well, now, you testified this morning that you had attended numerous meetings of the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow, Russia; is that right? A. Yes.

Q. Was the name of Bridges ever brought up in these meetings?

A. Yes. After the—during the 1934 strike in San Francisco and for a considerable period afterwards, at many of the meetings of the R.I.L.U., the Red International of Labor Unions, the work of the Communist Party in the marine industry was naturally discussed as a very important item [1438] on their agenda. The role of Harry Bridges, the part that he was playing in the waterfront—on the waterfront here on the West Coast was naturally very much discussed and very often.

Q. And he was referred to in these meetings?

A. In the early part of the 1934 strike at meetings that I attended in the R.I.L.U. there was considerable—not “doubt”. They didn’t know yet definitely whether Bridges was a party member; a Communist Party member. There are at some of the meetings that I attended. That is, the Russian people who were leaders of the R.I.L.U. didn’t know definitely that he was. Very shortly afterwards, though, through American Communist Party members who came there, through commu-

(Testimony of Nat. Honig.)

nications that they received regarding the activities on the waterfront in San Francisco, they knew definitely that he was a member of the Communist Party and they referred to him as such at many of these meetings and discussions.

Q. They knew definitely that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well, they felt that they knew it definitely because they had received word of this through what they regarded as authorized and qualified people, leaders of the American Communist Party.

Q. Who were some of those leaders of the American Communist Party? [1439]

A. Well, at various times while—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) Could we interrupt at this point to point out that the witness is being asked, not merely for hearsay but hearsay upon hearsay, and ~~we think~~ an objection lies to the testimony that he has given. We move to strike that testimony on that ground and we object to the line of questioning that Mr. Del Guercio is now pursuing on that point.

Presiding Inspector: I will rule on any particular question.

Mr. Gladstein: Well,—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I don't think that I will strike it out. You have allowed it to go in. If you had taken advantage of hearing it, we will let it stand in the record. But if this last question you object to, I will rule on that.

Mr. Gladstein: I want directly the objection

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

to go to the last two or three questions. It was impossible to tell simply from the form of the question—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, no. You could have told very well from the form of the question.

Mr. Gladstein: Does your Honor mean that just because we didn't make an objection fifteen seconds or thirty seconds ago—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) No—certainly I [1440] do. No, not thirty seconds. It is longer than thirty seconds.

Mr. Gladstein: I want the record to show—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You have allowed this testimony to go in without objection. I can't very well strike it out upon the ground that it is hearsay.

Mr. Gladstein: We will now make this request, if your Honor please. I can't be specific. I think it was the last three questions and answers.

Presiding Inspector: We will hear not the answers, but we will hear the last question and see what that is.

Mr. Gladstein: Could we have the last three or four questions read?

Presiding Inspector: If you would like to have them read, yes. I can't allow testimony to be received and then, if you don't like it, move to strike it out.

(The questions and answers referred to, were read by the reporter, as follows:

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"Q. And he was referred to in these meetings?"

"A. In the early part of the 1934 strike at meetings that I attended in the R.I.L.U. there was considerable—not "doubt". They didn't know yet definitely whether Bridges was a party member, a Communist Party member. These are at some of meetings that I attended. That is, the Russian people who [1441] were leaders of the R.I.L.U. didn't know definitely that he was. Very shortly afterwards, though, through American Communist Party members who came there, through communications that they received regarding the activities on the waterfront in San Francisco, they knew definitely that he was a member of the Communist Party and they referred to him as such at many of these meetings and discussions.

"Q. They knew definitely that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party?"

"A. Well, they felt that they knew it definitely because they had received word of this through what they regarded as authorized and qualified people, leaders of the American Communist Party.

"Q. Who were some of those leaders of the American Communist Party?"

"A. Well, at various times while——")

Mr. Gladstein: May I point out that I was mis-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

taken when I called this "double hearsay". It is actually "triple hearsay" that is being called for.

Presiding Inspector: The question is, Who were some of the leaders?

Mr. Gladstein: Previous to that.

Presiding Inspector: Well, you let that go.

Mr. Gladstein: We still make our motion to strike.

Presiding Inspector: You have your motion. At the same [1442] time I will deny it. Of course, that doesn't imply that any weight will be given to it.

Mr. Gladstein: I understand that. But so that the record may be clear and so that we don't waive any legal rights on the matter, I wish the record to now show that with respect to the hearsay testimony that was given to the last—in order to be safe on this matter—to the last half dozen questions before I made my objection, I move the Court for leave to have those answers set aside for the purpose of enabling me to object to the questions upon the ground that those questions call for hearsay.

Presiding Inspector: Well, now, how far back do you want to go?

Mr. Gladstein: I think the last six questions will certainly do it, and I mention "six" simply because I think that will cover it. I can't be specific because I didn't keep count of them. But I am talking about now the double and triple hearsay that was asked for, and given by the witness.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't know what you mean by "double" and "triple" hearsay..

Mr. Gladstein: Here's one question, for example, where he is asked and here is what he said. He says that somebody who came from the United States told somebody else in Russia who told him or from whom he heard that—Then he goes on and states.

[1443]

Now, in other words, it comes to this witness from Party A who obtained it from Party B, all unknown people, of course. So that, therefore, we have this witness testifying after he gets this from two other people. That is, there is the process of it starting from somebody who was either in the United States or left the United States and then it goes to a second party and now to a third person, namely, the witness. That's what I call "triple hearsay."

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, Counsel's statement is incorrect. The witness hasn't testified to that. The witness has testified that he attended certain meetings of high Communist officials in Russia; that certain representatives of the Communist Party in the United States appeared there before the meetings and in his presence stated that they knew of their own knowledge that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I didn't quite get that, but that may be what he intended to testify to. I will strike out those answers and let you ask them

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

again. If the people came there and said that, that is another thing. I didn't so understand it.

We will strike out as far back as you read, the questions and answers. Now, I will let you ask them again.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, you testified that you attended certain meetings of the Red International of Labor Unions in [1444] Moscow, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. At any time during these meetings in Moscow, Russia was the name of Harry Bridges discussed? A. Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: We will object to that as calling for hearsay, being immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. Go ahead now.

A. (Continuing) Yes. At quite a number of such meetings at which I was present as representative of the United States Communist Party to the the R.I.L.U., the name of Bridges was mentioned.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, who were at the meetings when the name of Bridges was discussed?

A. Well, there were the usual people who would attend these meetings regularly; representatives of various Communist Parties from practically every important nation in the world. I can mention some names, if you want me to. I mean, some of the delegates, from other countries.

Q. Yes, do that.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Well, for instance, from France there was a man named Monmousseau. From Germany, there was a man named Heckert—Fritz Heckert. He was the German representative to the Red International of Labor Unions. From China a [1445] delegate was named Li Li Sen. Those are three different names. From—well, some of the Russians, for instance, a man named Kutnik, who was my immediate superior in the Red International of Labor Unions.

Q. Were there any representatives of the Communist International there?

A. At some of these meetings there were. For instance, at various meetings there was a man Kuusinen, who was the leading official of the Communist International and he attended some of those meetings of the R.I.L.U. at which the name of Bridges was referred to.

Q. Were those meetings official meetings of the Red International of Labor Unions? A. Yes.

Q. Who called them?

A. The head of the Red International of Labor Unions; the General Secretary, Losofsky.

Q. And what was the purpose of these meetings?

A. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the work of the various Communist Parties in the different countries in the trade union field.

Q. And who brought up the name of Harry Bridges?

A. Various times Losofsky himself, the General Secretary, would refer to Harry Bridges as carry-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

ing out the program of the Communist Party in the maritime industry. Losofsky, the General [1446] Secretary.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, the witness has not stated that Mr. Losofsky did not know this of his own knowledge. It is quite obvious that Mr. Losofsky is giving hearsay, unless Mr. Del Guercio can lay a basis for indicating that he knew of it of his own knowledge.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think there is anything objectionable in the particualar answer given.

Mr. Grossman: I am objecting to it as hearsay, your Honor, on the basis that it is quite obvious from the context that this is hearsay from Losofsky.

Presiding Inspector: He only spoke on a general subject. We haven't got what he stated.

Mr. Grossman: We might as well make our objection at this time before we get in the information that would be obvious hearsay.

Presiding Inspector: I am not so sure that this is the time to make it. I have excluded it at the present time. You may make it at the propert time.

Will you read the answer, Mr. Reporter?

(The answer referred to was read by the reporter.) [1447]

Presiding Inspector: That is only his general comment on what he may have read in the newspaper, or anything. It doesn't anfount to anything.

Mr. Grossman: Still, it is hearsay

Presiding Inspector: No. It is no objection to

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

~~say it is hearsay. I think the objection should be that it is not relevant or material.~~

Mr. Gladstein: We made that objection previously and we make it again.

• Presiding Inspector: I didn't hear that. I heard about the second, third and fourth class hearsay. That is what the objection was. I will let that stand.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Would official reports from the Communist Party of the United States be the subject of discussions at these meetings?

A. Yes, they would.

Q. And who would read those official reports?

A. Who would read them?

Q. Yes.

A. They would be read by Losofsky himself. They would be sent to him directly from the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. And that was in the regular course of business in these meetings?

A. Yes. I would see many of these reports also. They [1448] would be shown to me.

Q. And would the name of Harry Bridges be in any of these reports?

A. The name of Harry Bridges was in some of them that I saw.

Q. That you saw yourself?

A. Yes.

Q. And what was said about Harry Bridges in these official reports received from the Communist Party of the United States?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Gladstein: Obviously this not only calls for hearsay, but it calls also for something that is not the best evidence; it is calling for a statement as to what is in writing.

Presiding Inspector: We would have to have it more fully described. I doubt very much whether you will gain anything by this line of questioning or not.

Mr. Del Guercio: These were official reports of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: But we haven't the reports, we don't know who made them, and we don't know when they were made, we don't know where they came from, what body.

Mr. Del Guercio: May I ask the witness further questions along this line?

Presiding Inspector: Certainly.

By Del Guercio: [1449]

Q. Where would these reports come from, Mr. Honig, in which Bridges' name was mentioned?

A. They would be reports signed by Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., by Jack Stachel, who at that time was head of the Trade Union Commission of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. I think practically all those reports, as far as I can remember, were under the signatures of those two.

Q. And they were official communications from the Communist Party of the United States to the Comintern, or Red International of Labor Unions?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes; to the Red International of Labor Unions specifically.

Q. You said you saw two or three of these reports?

A. Yes; I saw some of these reports.

Q. And the name of Harry Bridges was mentioned in those reports? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was Bridges referred to in those reports?

Mr. Gladstien: I again object on the ground that it calls for hearsay.

Presiding Inspector: That is true, it is hearsay. I suppose they want to show that he was called by some particular title which is prevalent among people belonging to that institution. Isn't that what you are objecting to? [1450]

Mr. Gladstien: I assume that is what Mr. Del Guercio is trying to prove. But we raise again this question of the impossibility of cross examining this witness, and I say this without any intention to reflect—

Presiding Inspector: I know it is impossible to examine on it.

Mr. Gladstien: What could prevent the witness from saying that he had seen this, that and the other in a document which obviously is not accessible to us?

Presiding Inspector: Nothing.

Mr. Gladstien: What would prevent him from doing that?

Presiding Inspector: Nothing.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Gladstein: Therefore, the impossibility of cross examining on that particular phase is what makes this objection that we now press of great weight and of great value, and is why we make the objection.

Presiding Inspector: From a legal standpoint and according to the technical rules of common law, it is, of course, objectionable. There is no doubt about that. The question is this: Shouldn't we take it in this administrative investigation?

Mr. Gladstein: We have tried, in an effort to expedite the hearing, not to object to various kinds of hearsay that were requested by Mr. Del Guercio. We haven't made objections to all the hearsay he has asked for. This kind of hearsay is [1451] precisely the sort that it would be impossible for us to attempt to rebut, and it would be impossible to cross examine the present witness on, because all he would have to do is to sit there and say over and over again he says he saw this particular reference in a document which is impossible for us to ever get, and which, according to what he says, he saw somewhere outside the territorial limits of the U.S.A.

Mr. Del Guercio: It isn't impossible, your Honor. If the defense wants to they can call Earl Browder here. The witness testified that Earl Browder submitted such a report. We will issue a subpoena for them if they want to get Earl Browder here to testify for the defense. He mentioned the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

name of Bridges in that report so it isn't that impossible.

Presiding Inspector: That is all right. We will hear Mr. Gladstein now.

Mr. Gladstein: If Mr. Del Guercio raises the point as to whether the best way of proving Mr. Earl Browder wrote a report which contains mention of Mr. Bridges, if he thinks that is the way of doing it then I imagine it would be up to him to call Mr. Browder, and not up to the defense, because the legal objection we make still has merit. His suggestion that there is a stronger way of attempting to prove the point that he is trying to prove, that is something for him to overcome, and for us, because the burden is on him to establish what he is trying to establish. [1452]

Presiding Inspector: This witness has given the general reputation of Mr. Bridges, as a member of the Communist Party, among those whom he knew. I doubt whether you are going to gain anything by specific reference of this kind.

Mr. Del Guercio: Permit me to ask a few questions along that line and I will see.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Mr. Bridges referred to as "Comrade Bridges" in any of these meetings by representatives of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. Gladstein: We make the same objection.

Presiding Inspector: I will exclude that.

Mr. Del Guercio: What?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: I will exclude that.

Now, you are asking for a particular occasion on which somebody in an official meeting used the name of "Comrade." I don't think that names amount to anything.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Harry Bridges recognized as a member of the Communist Party—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) I object to that not only as—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interrupting) Wait until I finish my question. [1453]

Presiding Inspector: Let him finish his question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing) —recognized as a member of the Communist Party in these official meetings of the Red International of Labor Unions at Moscow?

Mr. Gladstein: I object to the question as calling for the opinion and conclusion of the witness, as well as hearsay.

Presiding Inspector: I think perhaps that is so. But the calls for the witness' statement as to what was the general reputation, among those people, as to whether Mr. Bridges was a member of the Communist Party. Despite the fact that it may be of slight importance I will take it.

You may enter your objection.

Mr. Gladstein: We simply want to make the objection that it calls for the opinion and conclusion of the witness.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Not the opinion; there is no opinion here.

Mr. Gladstein: I think it does, because it is asking this witness whether Mr. Bridges was recognized—

Presiding Inspector: I have excluded that question, but I have made a suggestion of another one.

Mr. Gladstein: I see.

Presiding Inspector: The question that I suggest, and I don't know whether Mr. Del Guercio will accept it or not, is [1454] that he may ask whether he knows what the reputation in respect to Mr. Bridges' membership in the Communist Party was among Communist officials. If he says "Yes" I will let him say what it was.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will withdraw the last question and ask you another one.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You have testified, I believe, that Harry Bridges was discussed in these meetings?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Bridges' reputation among those people that were present at these meetings at the time that Bridges was discussed as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Gladstein: Just one moment.

Presiding Inspector: "Yes" or "No."

Mr. Gladstein: First, we object to the question on the ground that it calls for reputation testimony, and on the ground that it calls for hearsay, and

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

on the ground that it calls for the opinion of this witness.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't call for opinion.

Mr. Gladstein: And on the further ground that no appropriate foundation has been laid for the opinion being called for in the question.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it calls for an opinion. It is a question of whether he knows his general reputation [1455] in this respect among those people. That is all the question is.

"Yes" or "No"—do you know?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What was that?

Mr. Gladstein: Same objection.

Presiding Inspector: It is all repetition. It is already in the record. I will allow it. It went in without objection earlier. This is only confined to a particular group. That is all.

Mr. Gladstein: I understand, but in view of what you previously said I thought the safest way and easiest way was to enter an objection to the particular question since you previously announced that you would rule on objections to specific questions.

Presiding Inspector: Yes; but long before that occurred it was testified by this witness that Mr. Bridges was generally recognized as a member of the Communist Party. This is only an amplification, that is, as to whether he was generally recognized

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

and what his reputation was in that respect among this influential group.

I do not think it is of the greatest importance.

Go ahead.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think the witness went further. He [1456] has testified that he knows Harry Bridges is a member of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: That may be.

You may answer.

A. Yes. His reputation among the leading officials of the Red International of Labor Unions was that of being an active member of the Communist Party, leading member of the Communist Party in the waterfront work and the work among Maritime Unions.

Presiding Inspector: That answers the question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I believe that you testified early this morning that after your return from Russia you went to New York, and after remaining there for a few months you came to the West Coast and became associated with the Western Worker?

A. Yes.

Q. What name did you use while you were associated with the Western Worker?

A. Well, as a pen name for articles which I wrote, I used the name "Nat Davis"; that is for articles I wrote for the Western Worker.

Q. How long did you use that name—when did you first begin using it?

(Testimony of Nat Hopig.)

A. When I went to the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow they asked to see my passport. On the passport was [1457] my right name, Nat Honig. They said "You cannot use your right name here. You will have to use an assumed name."

Well, I said I hadn't thought of that, but I suppose I could if I thought of it.

They said, "We will think of a name for you." And they thought of the one "Nat Davis." They said "That will be your name here." That was where I first used that name. It was wished on me in this case.

Q. And what was your work on the Western Worker, what was the nature of it?

A. In the first place, I should say roughly, five or six months, four or five months, I was labor editor, which meant that I was in charge of all trade union news, news of trade union activity, strikes, and so forth, labor disputes.

I was in charge of a labor page—they had a complete labor page—which I myself organized for the Western Worker.

Then later on I was managing editor—not editor-in-chief, but managing editor.

Q. And as such did you attend purely Communist Party meetings?

A. Yes; all sorts of Communist Party meetings.

Q. How would you attend these meetings, that is, who would request you to attend the meetings?

A. Well, of course, it depends on which type of meeting you are referring to. [1458]

2154

Harry Bridges vs.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. How many types of meetings are there?

A. Each Communist Party member was a member of his unit. That is the lowest, the smallest section of the Communist Party. Well, I attended such unit meetings.

Then there were various Section Committee meetings, meetings of the leading bodies of the Sections, which are territorial divisions of the Communist Party. I attended such meetings here in San Francisco.

Then there were District Committee meetings, to which I was invited to attend many times.

Then there were meetings of the Trade Union Section of the Communist Party, called by the Trade Union Director, so to speak, and I attended many of these.

Then there were what were called Top Fraction meetings of the Maritime Industry.

A Top Fraction consists of those Communist Party members who are leading officials, or the most active Communists within a certain industry or a certain Union.

The Top Fraction meetings that I attended in San Francisco of the Communist Party for the Maritime Industry would be attended by Communist Party members who held leading official positions in the waterfront Unions or unions connected with the waterfront in some way; and they would be attended also by a few who were members of such unions and who were Communist Party members, and who may not have been actually officials.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

of [1459] these Unions, but, nevertheless, were doing leading work for the Party, very important work for the Party in those unions. And, in addition to them, certain of the leading Communist Party District officials would attend and, perhaps; occasionally some of the County officials here in San Francisco County would also attend.

I, myself, attended, particularly in the period of the 1936 and 1937 strike, at the invitation and request of the Communist Party District, located here at that time at 121 Eighth Street, because as labor editor of the Western Worker it was felt, as they told me, that I should attend these meetings and get the background for the stories on labor events that I would be writing up, particularly on the strike at that time, for the Western Worker.

Q. You described five meetings, types of meetings—the Unit meeting, Section meeting, District meeting, Trade Union Unity League meeting—

A. (Interposing) No, no. At that time there was no Trade Union Unity League. They were not Trade Union Unity League meetings, but being so called by the men in charge of all trade union work for the Communist Party of the District.

Q. And then the Top Fraction meetings?

A. Yes; of the Maritime Industry.

Q. Of the Maritime Industry?

A. Yes.

[1460]

Q. How many such Top Fraction meetings of the Maritime Industry did you attend during that period of time, that is, in 1936 and 1937?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. You say how many of them?

Q. Yes.

A. I couldn't say exactly during the period of the 1936-1937 strike, which lasted, I think, from about, I guess, October or November, perhaps September, 1936, to February 1937, but there was at least one such Top Fraction meeting held each week, generally on a Sunday evening. I don't think I missed more than maybe two or three of such meetings for one reason or another.

So that while I cannot figure out off-hand exactly how many, I did attend practically every one of them during that period of the 1936-1937 strike.

Q. Where would these meetings be held?

A. They would be held at the homes of various more or less obscure members of the Communist Party—the more obscure they were the better it was thought to be—because there would be more protection for these meetings and the more secret they would be.

Q. And who would give you the address of the various meetings?

A. Often they would be given to me by Walter Lambert, who was the man in charge of Trade Union work for the Communist Party in the California District. [1461]

Sometimes it would be given to me by William Schneiderman, the District Secretary of the Communist Party for this District.

Occasionally it would be given to me by Schneiderman's Secretary.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. And what would he say to you, if anything, when he gave you the address at which the meeting was to be held?

A. I would be told, and I made it a general practice, and I believe all the people who attended were told and made it a practice, I know I did, if the address was given to me on a slip of paper, of memorizing it promptly and tearing it up; and then when I got to the place, to the address, promptly forgetting the address itself; or else, if I was told the address I would simply memorize it myself and then when I came to the meeting place I would forget it.

I would never be told the name, at least practically never, the name of the party who owned the apartment, or the home at which the meeting was to be held, and I wasn't particularly interested in that. All I wanted was the address so I could get there.

Q. Now, was Walter Lambert connected with any union during that period of time?

A. To the best of my memory, or recollection, is that he was no official of any union. I know he was a member, I think, of some American Federation of Labor Union, but I can't [1462] remember which one it was.

Q. But he was an official of the Communist Party?

A. He was an official of the District of the Communist Party.

Q. Was Schneiderman, Bill Schneiderman, a member of any union?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I don't believe he was. I think, I know that he had been a member of the Cleaners and Dyers Union at one time, but I can't say whether he was at that time.

Q. But he was the District Secretary of the Communist Party?

A. District Secretary of the Communist Party; yes.

Q. Now, did you ever see the Alien here in any of those meetings?

A. I saw Harry Bridges present at a good many of these meetings. In fact, during the 1936-1937 strike period, except on those occasions when he was out of town when he would leave town, perhaps, to address a meeting in some other city on the West Coast, he would be present at all these meetings. Those are the only ones I didn't see him at.

Mr. Gladstein: What is the last sentence in that answer?

(The sentence referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What do you mean "Those were the only occasions you didn't see him at?" [1463]

A. I say, except the meetings held at a time when Bridges was out of town, I saw him at all the meetings held in the period of the 1936-1937 waterfront strike. In other words, the only ones that he missed that I was present at were those held when he was out of town.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. You are talking about the Top Fraction meetings held in private homes here? A. Yes.

Q. Top Fraction meetings of the Communist Party?

A. Yes; of the Communist Party for the Maritime Industry.

Q. These meetings were only attended by members of the Communist Party?

A. They can only be attended by members of the Communist Party.

Q. What was the purpose of these meetings?

A. To work out the day-to-day tactics and strategy to be pursued in the course of the 1936-1937 waterfront strike on the Coast, and particularly for the San Francisco and Bay area.

Q. To work out whose strategy and tactics?

A. The strategy that the Communist Party desired its members in these unions to follow and try to get the workers in these various branches of the Maritime Industry to follow. [1464]

Q. And would a high functionary of the Communist Party be present at every one of these meetings?

A. At every one of these meetings there would be at least one such functionary of the Communist Party.

Q. And who were some of those functionaries that were present during the time that Harry Bridges was present?

A. Very often it would be Walter Lambert; very often William Schneidermann; sometimes Betty

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Gannett, who was what they called "Agitprop," Agitation and Propaganda Director for the district; sometimes Frank Spector, who I believe had the title of Organizational Director for the Communist Party for this district at that time; sometimes all of them; sometimes a combination of them, but at least one of them would be present at every such meeting.

Q. And why would such a high functionary of the Communist Party be present?

A. Because these meetings were held for the purpose of working out the Communist Party strategy, the day-to-day strategy and tactics for the waterfront, and a leading official, a member of the highest body of the Communist Party for the district, would have to be there to see that the strategy, the tactics worked out would be in line with what the Communist Party desired.

Q. In how many of such meetings—I mean by "such meetings" top fraction meetings—was Bridges present? [1464-a]

A. I couldn't off-hand tell you how many.

Q. Approximately.

A. I could name a minimum number that I know that I was present at and Harry Bridges was present at at the same time. I would say ten, an arbitrary number, and it is a very arbitrary number.

Q. Would you say there were more than ten such meetings?

A. Yes. It is arbitrary in the sense that there were more than ten. I'm trying to be conservative.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Well, how many would you venture—we want your best recollection, of course. How many such meetings did you attend all together during the 1936-37 strike?

A. I could best answer that by figuring out the number of weeks that that strike lasted.

Q. All right, let's do that. The strike began when? In December of 1936, I believe you said.

A. I believe I said November or December. I can't tell you the exact month. But—

Q. (Interposing) Well, assuming that the strike was called in December—

A. (Interposing) Let us assume it was called in November, just for the purpose of a rough figuring out.

Q. And when did the strike end?

A. It ended in February. [1465]

Q. February, 1937? A. '37.

Q. Now, that would be December, January, February?

A. Well, approximately three months, anyway.

Q. Twelve or thirteen weeks. Would that be correct?

A. Yes, I think that would be correct.

Q. All right. In those twelve or thirteen weeks how many meetings did you have?

A. There would be a minimum of thirteen meetings, figuring on the basis of thirteen weeks; one week anyway. Sometimes it would be more than one.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. And at how many such meetings did you see Harry Bridges?

A. Well, again I would say ten anyway, being conservative.

Q. In any of those top fraction meetings at which Harry Bridges was present was the strategy or practices of the Communist Party as set down by either the national headquarters of the Communist Party or the Communist International discussed?

A. Specifically at one meeting, one of the top fraction meetings—I can't remember the exact date—that was held, a change of policy in respect to affiliation of Longshoremen's Union was discussed. This was not during the strike itself. This was one of the later meetings at which Harry Bridges was [1466] present and I was present. And the idea then, the new policy, was to be for the Longshoremen's Union to be affiliated with the CIO, and it was discussed there that this was a policy that had been adopted—that is, transmitted to the Communist Party here at San Francisco from the Central Committee of the Communist Party in New York.

Q. Now, did Harry Bridges participate in the discussions at these various meetings?

A. Yes.

Q. During the strike?

A. Yes. He spoke at these meetings.

Q. What would be the nature of his participation, if you know?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Well, in general he would discuss methods that he thought, as he saw them, might be used in strategy in carrying out the work of the Communist Party on the waterfront here in San Francisco and other ports along the Coast, among other things. Then they would discuss the attitude of certain other union officials who were non-Communists towards the Communist Party, towards Bridges; along that line.

Q. Now, were decisions reached in these meetings?

A. Decisions on day-to-day policy, yes. Major decisions, as far as basic policy was concerned, such as change of policy or change of important policy, would come from the Central Committee in New York. [1467]

Q. And what would be the effect of the decisions reached in these various meetings on all the persons, Communist Party members who attended the meeting?

A. Obedience in carrying out such decisions was mandatory.

Q. Was mandatory? A. Yes.

Q. And it would be mandatory upon Bridges to carry it out also?

A. Yes. As a Communist Party member it would be mandatory upon him to do so.

Q. How many other meetings in which Harry Bridges was present did you attend?

A. No other type of Communist Party meeting.

Q. No other type of Communist Party meeting?

A. Was he present at.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Well, did you attend any Communist Party meetings in which Harry Bridges was present after the 1936 strike?

A. Oh, yes. These top fraction meetings continued after that for some time. They perhaps weren't held regularly every week. For a while they were, and an attempt was made to keep them up from that period. But since the major struggle had ended, had been settled it wasn't felt the need to hold them quite as often. But I think they might average from then on once every two weeks. It doesn't mean that they were held every two weeks, but if you struck an average it would [1468] amount to that.

Q. And it was the same type of top fraction meetings of the Communist Party?

A. The same type.

Q. And attended only by Communist Party members?

A. Only by Communist Party members.

Q. And in how many such meetings was Harry Bridges present that you were present at?

A. Do you mean subsequent to the strike?

Q. Subsequent to the 1936-37 strike.

A. He wasn't always present at these meetings after the strike; more occasionally this time. And again I would have to strike a pretty rough average because I can't remember exactly how many. I would say at least half a dozen anyway.

Q. A half a dozen?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. And that in addition to the ten that you have just testified to? A. Yes.

Q. Would there also be present high functionaries of the Communist Party who were not officials of labor unions? A. At least one.

Q. And Bridges would participate in such meetings?

A. Yes. That is, he would talk and take part in the [1469] discussions.

Q. Were there any top fraction meetings of the Communist Party before the 1936 strike that you attended in which Harry Bridges was present?

A. No, not before then.

Q. So, then, you would state that you attended roughly about sixteen top fraction Communist meetings in which Harry Bridges was present and participated?

A. Yes. I would say that is a minimum figure.

Q. That is the minimum? That is the most conservative figure you would say? A. Yes.

Q. There probably would be more than sixteen such meetings?

Presiding Inspector: Oh, Mr. Del Guercio, what is the use?

Mr. Del Guercio: All right. I will withdraw the question.

Presiding Inspector: Just to change the tone of voice, I will ask a question or two.

Were these meetings formal meetings?

The Witness: Yes, formal meetings.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Was there a presiding officer? —

The Witness: Yes, there was a Chairman.

Presiding Inspector: And people addressed the Chair? [1470]

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: What do they call the Chairman?

The Witness: Oh, "Comrade Chairman".

Presiding Inspector: "Comrade Chairman". Did you have a Comrade Secretary?

The Witness: Yes. There would be a comrade who would take notes on what had been discussed.

Presiding Inspector: Sometimes would you pass resolutions?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: And sometimes express the sense of the meeting?

The Witness: No. They wouldn't pass resolutions at those meetings. They would decide there on what resolutions they thought ought to be passed in the unions.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes, yes, they would express the sense of the members there present as to what ought to be done?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Bridges ever chosen as Chairman in any of these meetings?

A. I can't say definitely that he was. I can only say this about the Chairman: He wasn't a per-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

manent Chairman; at each meeting they would try to get somebody to act as Chairman. Generally everybody would be reluctant to do so because, [1471] if you are in the Chair, you don't get as much of a chance to talk. So they would have quite a time trying to get one.

Presiding Inspector: It depends on who the Chairman is?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: It is universal in those meetings to speak of various persons present by a Party name? They call you "Comrade Davis"?

The Witness: It depends. Sometimes.

Presiding Inspector: They would call you "Mr. Davis"?

The Witness: No, they wouldn't use the word "mister". That was bourgeois. But sometimes they would call a man by his first name. They would say "Harry" to Harry Bridges, or they would call Schneidermann "Bill". Sometimes they would say "Comrade Bridges", "Comrade Schneidermann".

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. As Managing Editor of the Western Worker were you required to write up the Communist Party policy regarding trade union activities?

A. Yes. Many times—at least I would say several times—I would write articles regarding Communist Party policy in trade unions under the name of Nat Davis.

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a short recess?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Yes. We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

[1472]

Presiding Inspector: Resume, Mr. Del Guercio.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, who were some of the other men, other than Harry Bridges who attended these top fraction meetings that you described?

A. I will try to kind of group them by the unions they came from. That would be the easiest way, I think. From the Longshoremen's Union there were Henry Schmidt—

Q. (Interposing) Now, just a minute! Henry Schmidt, do you see him in this Court room?

A. Yes. He's the second man from this end standing against the wall (Indicating).

Q. Is he standing near the officer there?

A. Yes.

Q. The man right next to the officer?

A. At least from here it looks like him to me.

Q. Is there any question that that is the Henry Schmidt?

A. Well, from here, as far as my eyes can see, it looks like him to me.

Q. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was at that time.

Q. What are some of the others?

A. Also from the Longshoremen's—

Q. (Interposing) Who?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Also from the Longshoremen was John Schomacker. [1473]

Q. How do you spell that?

A. I believe it is S-c-h-o-m-a-c-k-e-r, or perhaps it has an "e" after that "o". I never knew exactly. And there was "Bebe" Jones. I imagine you spell that "B-e-b-e" Jones. That was the name we knew him by.

Q. Were Schomacker and Jones members of the Communist Party?

A. Yes. They attended the Communist Party top fraction meetings, and Harry Bridges also from the Longshoremen.

Q. And was he a member of the Communist—I believe you have already testified that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. And who else?

A. Also from the Longshoremen there was a man named Halling, but I don't remember his first name.

Q. So I don't need to ask you this question again, all these names that you are going to give are members of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

A. Then from the Marine Cooks and Stewards was Revels Cayton; and he would attend these meetings pretty regularly.

Q. Yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. From the Sailor's Union of the Pacific was a man named Al Quittenden. [1474]

Q. Al What?

A. Al Quittenden; Q-u-i-t-t-e-n-d-e-n. Perhaps it was "d-ò-n". And Dave Saunders, who occasionally would be at those meetings. They were from the Sailer's Union. I don't believe that they were there officially representing these unions. They were Communists who were extremely active or had leading posts in these unions.

Q. I see.

A. From the Warehousemen's Union, which was part of the Longshoremen's Union, a section of it, were Archie Brown occasionally and Lou Goldblatt.

Q. The Brown also referred to is Zack Brown?

A. No. This is Archie Brown.

Q. Archie Brown?

A. From the American Radio Telegraphists Association were Roy Pyle, Mervin Rathbone, and this Z. Brown. Whether it was "Zack" or "Zeke" I forget. I think it was "Zack". Brown was not only from the ARTA, the American Radio Telegraphists Association, but he was an official of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific in the Bay area at that time. And also, of course, were—I guess I have mentioned some of the leading officials of the Communist Party who would attend those meetings.

Q. Will you state them again?

A. Well, William Schneidermann, Frank Spector. [1475]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. What was William Schneidermann?

A. He was District Secretary.

Q. Of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. And what was Frank Spector?

A. He was a member of the District Executive Committee and, I believe, if memory serves me right, Organizational Secretary for the district for the Party at that time, anyway.

Q. Do you know if Frank Spector had been made a subject of deportation proceedings or had been ordered deported as a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, I don't know that. And Betty Gannett, who was what they called Agitprop Director.

Q. Did you ever see Elmer Hanoff in any of these meetings?

A. Yes, he occasionally attended.

Q. Who was Elmer Hanoff?

A. He was a member of the District Executive Committee of the Communist Party. I believe he became severely ill later and was unable to attend these meetings any longer, but I may be wrong as to the time he became ill. He did attend some of these meetings.

Q. How about Sam Telford?

A. Sam Telford occasionally did. He was there as an official of the Communist Party Waterfront Section. [1476]

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, do you know George Wilson?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I don't know him socially. I have seen him, met him, spoken to him.

Q. Do you know the Goerge Wilson I mean? I mean the George Wilson that is Chairman of the Harry Bridges Defense Committee, so-called defense committee?

A. I have heard that he is chairman of that. I have just read that he is.

Q. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know him from having met with him at any Communist Party meetings, and while I was in San Francisco I can almost definitely state that he was not a member of the Communist Party. But from members of the Communist Party still in the Communist Party in San Francisco and some in the American Newspaper Guild in other cities who still—I still have contact with—I know that he is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Grossman: Just a moment! It is quite obvious, though the question does not call for hearsay, this witness has been answering it from hearsay. And I move, therefore, that the answer be stricken, obviously because there cannot be an answer from direct knowledge of the witness.

Presiding Inspector: I will strike out all remarks after his statement that he was quite sure at that time that he [1477] was not a member of the Communist Party.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you know George Wilson's reputation since that time?

Mr. Gladstein: I am going to make the same objection.

Presiding Inspector: Do you think that is material at this time?

Mr. Del Guercio: He is Chairman of the Defense Committee and he has been sitting in the Court room here.

Presiding Inspector: We are not trying the Defense Committee or anything of the kind. I think I will exclude it as too remote.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you know Estoly Ward? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Gladstein: I object to that as immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know who he is. Was he at any of these meetings?

Mr. Del Guercio: I think later on we may bring in something about Estoly Ward. He wrote a book here on—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I think we had better postpone it until that time.

Mr. Del Guercio: We won't have this witness available. [1478]

Presiding Inspector: Unless you say that you are going to connect it up. If you say you are going to connect it up, I will take it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: That is my present plan, to connect it up. We are laying a foundation for it now.

Presiding Inspector: Well, you don't yet say whether you are going to connect it up.

Mr. Del Guercio: I said we are going to connect it up, that Estoly Ward is a person who wrote a book on the "Persecution of Harry Bridges" or some such book.

Mr. Gladstein: I still make the objection.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think that would connect it up. I will exclude it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Very well, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, you have defined the way you are going to connect it up, and I don't think that would be sufficient.

Mr. Del Guercio: I won't press it, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, in any of these meetings that you have described, Top Fraction meetings of the Communist Party, did Harry Bridges ever mention the name of Harry Lundeberg?

A. Oh, yes. He frequently did.

Q. And what did Bridges say about Harry Lundeberg?

A. Well, Bridges didn't like Lundeberg very much. [1479] Lundeberg was consistently opposed to Bridges. In Bridges' own words at these meetings, Lundeberg was fighting the Communist Party policy in the waterfront industries and sometimes

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Bridges would be very angry about—would express anger about Lundeberg's attitude, and he would say words which to me seemed to be more in hot-headedness. But he would say definitely that Lundeberg "ought to be dumped" and "We ought to see to it that he is dumped", and he would refer to others in the Sailor's Union who were what he would call "henchmen of Lundeberg".

Q. What do you mean when he used the word "dumped"?

A. Well, "dumped" is a term along the waterfront which means "beaten up"; perhaps seriously hurt. Beaten up with that general intention of seriously hurting someone.

Q. Who is Harry—well, never mind. Strike that out. Do you know Sam Darey?

A. Yes, I know Sam Darey.

Q. Who is Sam Darey?

A. I don't know what his present position in the Communist Party is.

Q. I mean at the time you were a member?

A. But I knew it, and when I was a member of the Communist Party at various times he was District Organizer of the Communist Party—District Secretary for California.

Q. Here in San Francisco?

A. Yes, with headquarters here. Later on he was—[1480] I knew him before that when he was for a while a member of the Daily Worker's staff in New York. Later on I met him when he was a

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

delegate to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, held in 1935.

Q. Can you fix it more definite than that, the year 1935? The month?

A. You mean the month of the Congress?

Q. Yes.

A. I can. It began, I'm definitely sure, the last week in July of 1935 and lasted about a month.

Q. Perhaps this will refresh your memory, Mr. Honig. I am showing it to you for that purpose. I have here a copy of the International Correspondence, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist Party, a continuation of the discussion and report of the activities of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Seventh Session. "Comrade Browder, U.S.A., as Chairman, opened the session", dated Moscow, July 28, 1935. Among other things there appears "Contents" and under the "5", "1. Comrade Darcy, U.S.A." and a page reference, I believe, to 1275. Does that refresh your recollection as to the time that you saw Sam Darcy in Moscow?

A. Yes, it does. And I recall this particular issue.

Q. Do you know if Sam Darcy made a speech on that occasion?

A. Yes. He made a report as a delegate from the [1481] American Communist Party.

Q. And do you know what in substance was—you heard the speech, didn't you?

A. Yes. I heard the speech.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. You were present there?

A. Yes, I was present.

Q. And what briefly was the subject of the speech?

Mr. Gladstein: That is objected to as immaterial, calling for hearsay.

Presiding Inspector: Now, wait!

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Wait! Does it relate to Mr. Bridges?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes, it relates to Mr. Bridges, and we have already in evidence that Sam Darcy attended meetings with Harry Bridges here in the U.S.A.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Is Mr. Darcy living?

The Witness: The last I heard of him he was.

Presiding Inspector: Is he around San Francisco?

The Witness: I couldn't say because I don't know.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: What was the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.) [1482]

A. The subject of his speech was mainly on the Maritime—the work of the Communist Party in the Maritime industry of the West Coast, particularly referring to California.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did Mr. Darcy mention anything about the activities of the Communist Party during the 1934 strike in San Francisco? A. Yes, he did.

Q. What did he say in that connection?

A. Of course I can't tell you exact words. The speech was a long one. It occurred some time ago. I can only tell you my recollection of the gist of it.

Q. Did Darcy's speech appear in any newspaper?

A. Excerpts from it appeared through an Associated Press dispatch which I recall definitely reading in the New York Times on the front page for July 31, 1935, and that's the only American daily newspaper that I recall any excerpts or any parts of his speech being printed.

Q. For the purpose of refreshing your memory I will show you a photostatic copy of a certain article appearing in the New York Times July 31, 1935, an article written by Harold Denny, "Special cable to the New York Times," bearing the date "Moscow, July 30." Does that article contain any abstracts from Darcy's speech as you heard it?

A. Well, I want to look at the abstracts they have here [1483] yes. (Reading abstracts.) Yes. I have only bothered to read here direct quotes. I haven't read the rest of the text, and the excerpts as they appear here may not be word for word—undoubtedly aren't word for word what he said.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

but in essence they are what I heard him say in that speech.

Q. Substantially what you heard? A. Yes.

Q. I will refer you particularly to the statement that appears in this article: " 'Even as late as' "—this appears in quotes. " 'Even as late as 1933, the sea transport workers on the west coast were not organized in trade unions,' said Mr. Darcy. 'We started persuading the workers not only to join the American Federation of Labor but to become its active leading members. A great number joined and eventually we were at the head of many thousands of workers. A strike committee was elected after the strike had been decided on and our comrades headed it. Nevertheless, the local trade union bureaucrats managed to become strike leaders and finally to betray it.' "

By Mr. Guercio:

Q. Did you hear Darcy say that?

A. Yes. The first sentence or so there may not be word for word, but the last two sentences there—I remember those particularly because they created a sort of a sensation and that stuck in my mind. Those last two sentences are, as far [1484] as I can recall, almost word for word what he did say.

Q. And to what strike was Sam Darcy referring?

A. He had been speaking in his speech of the 1934 strike—the 1934 general strike—prior to that in excerpts which are not printed in the Times, the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

speech that I heard him make, and this was a continuation of his reference to that strike. [1485]:

Q. During the 1934 strike here in San Francisco? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this article in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received without objection.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 244.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you know who was at the head of the strike committee during the 1934 strike on the Pacific Coast here in San Francisco?

A. I wasn't here in 1934 so I couldn't testify as to that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will withdraw the question. If counsel has no objection, I move that the answer be stricken as I withdrew the question.

Mr. Galdstein: You have asked him other things earlier today that he didn't know.

Mr. Del Guercio: Let it stay in there.

Mr. Galdstein: We have no objection to the state of the record as it is.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did Darcy say anything in his speech about a coming strike on the Pacific Coast? [1486]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. He predicted that there would be a general strike, another general strike along the waterfront in San Francisco in September of 1935.

Q. Did he say who would bring that about?

A. He said the Communist Party would head it, would prepare it and lead it.

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, what is your attitude toward trade unions?

A. My attitude toward trade unions is this: I would say that I inherited, through my father, an attitude of firm support and belief in trade unions. My father was very strict on the question. All of my family were trade union members and it was natural that as soon as I could possibly join a union in any trade that I was working at I would. In the newspaper industry there wasn't a union organized while I was working in it until 1935, I believe, and then I joined the Newspaper Guild because of my belief in trade unions, in 1936 here in San Francisco.

My attitude toward trade unions is one of firm belief in them, firm belief for the necessity of trade unions, and for their value to those who work and for the industry as a whole.

Q. Have you ever testified before the Dies Committee?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever testified before any governmental committee, Federal, State or otherwise?

[1487]

A. Not before any governmental committee.

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, do you know Matt Meehan?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I have seen him on a number of occasions at public meetings.

Q. Do you know if he was a member of the Communist Party at any time during your membership?

A. I know from the fact that in Seattle for a time I was a member of the District Committee, of the Northwestern District of the Communist Party and I know that in meetings that I participated in he was referred to, and his work was referred to as a Communist in waterfront work.

Mr. Gladstein: I make the same objection and move that the answer go out.

Presiding Inspector: Strike it out. It is too remote.

Mr. Del Guercio: We are going to establish that Matt Meehan was a member of the Communist Party. We will have other witnesses here.

Presiding Inspector: Matt Meehan?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. He was supposed to be at a certain meeting at which Bridges attended.

Presiding Inspector: He is one of the two that has been named?

Mr. Del Guercio: He has been heretofore named several times.

Presiding Inspector: What difference does it make? [1488]

Has anyone testified about his being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes; Mrs. Lovelace has.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: She testified he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Then you don't need this, if you have direct proof someone referred to him as such. It don't help very much.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Why did you leave the Communist Party, Mr. Honig? A. Why or when?

Q. Why?

A. I left the Communist Party, in the first place, with the signing of the pact between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. I could see no longer any support for the claims of the Communist Party that it was opposed to Fascism. It was to me very much a complete reversal of everything that the Communist Party had taught me, and I had seen it teach other members, and it had had me teach other members, that it stood for, namely, a defense of democracy.

Particularly, in the two or three years previous to that the Communist Party had stated that it was going to change its policy, its attitude toward Democracy, and that really now, sincerely, it wanted to support Democracy,—a step which I, [1489] and many others I knew in the Communist Party, hailed.

With the signing of the pact with Hitler, particularly at a time when the democracies seemed to be almost certain to come to blows with Fascist Germany, to me it represented nothing but

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

the fact that the Soviet Government was swinging the Communist Party closer into line with what the Fascists stood for.

Subsequent developments along that line convinced me all the more that that was true.

That was, by a long way, the deciding factor in making me leave the Communist Party.

Also I had become disillusioned with the leaders of the Communist Party more and more so for several years before that. But I had operated on the theory, and I had expressed it to other party members when I discussed it, that as long as I felt that I believed in the basic principles of the Party, and I felt I was a sincere Communist Party member, that there was no reason that I should condemn the Communist Party as a whole because of what I thought of the leaders of it, certain leaders, or maybe the majority. But I had seen them very closely, particularly in those recent years, and I had seen them at work, and in the trade unions, and I knew in my mind that they were opportunists; that they were not there mainly for the benefit of the membership of the trade unions, even though in some cases to maintain and strengthen their position [1490] they would have to do certain things to obtain some things for those members.

But experiences with Communist Party members who were leaders of trade unions convinced me that the leadership was opportunistic and, therefore, this represented another disillusionment in

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

my mind as to the policy, as to the sincerity of the Communist Party leadership.

There a complete lack of democracy within the Communist Party itself was another thing that caused me to leave. There had been some semblance of it when I first entered the Party, and there had been the idea prevalent that there would be more and more democracy allowed; especially allowed members of the Communist Party in reaching decisions in elections on officials of the Communist Party. But it eventually developed to the contrary. In succeeding years any semblance of democracy in the Communist Party disappeared.

The thing, particularly along that line, that made me disillusioned with the party was that there was a constitution drawn up, a very beautiful document, full of high-sounding phrases about democracy, and the rank and file member of the Communist Party, his word being final, and the law and so forth, or words to that effect, and the man who decides the policy, but despite all that—for instance, when it was decided that a change in line of the Communist Party, or change in policy in its attitude toward the people's front, towards building a [1491] democratic front, was to be changed and done away with, the membership were not allowed to vote, but merely informed that there had been a change; that we were no longer going to say "three cheers for democracy," but on the other hand "down with democracy," and "We are going to call it a capitalist democracy"; whereas the day before it was real

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

democracy we were fighting to preserve, and then the next day it was a capitalist democracy and down with it. No votes were taken among the party members, the membership was not consulted, but was told that it was a new policy and the members would have to obey it if they wanted to remain Communist Party members.

These were the major factors that made me leave the Communist Party.

Q. Mr. Honig, have you ever been charged with any crime?

A. Yes. I was arrested in Bayonne, New Jersey. I think it was in the year 1931. That was in connection with the distribution of the Communist Party Trade Union Unity League literature at a plant there, the Standard Oil Company. My arrest came about because I testified that two girls that were distributing, Young Communist League members who were distributing this literature, and were reputedly cluttering up the streets with it. I testified they were not littering up the streets. As a matter of fact, I had actually bought a copy of the paper they were selling there at the gates of this plant. [1492] I was charged with contempt of court and fined \$15 in that case.

That is the only time I have been arrested, or charged with anything.

Q. Have you ever been charged with any other crime since then, and convicted? A. No.

Q. Did you recently have some trouble in connection with some books in Seattle?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. In a book store in Seattle, I guess about three or four weeks ago, where I have bought many books, I was held—I wouldn't say "held"—I was taken down to the Police Station in Seattle in connection with some books that were taken from this place. I was not charged, I was not arrested, and the books that I had I paid for, and I was not arrested or charged in the case.

Q. Had you purchased books at that book store before? A. Yes; frequently.

Q. Are you a book collector?

A. Yes, I like books and I collect books.

Q. Have you had any other difficulties—

A. (Interposing): Difficulties—you mean in connection with the police?

Q. In connection with the law, I mean?

A. No.

Q. Have you received any threatening communications [1493] prior to your testifying here?

A. I have not received written threatening communications, but in the past two or three weeks, both at my place of work in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and at home, my wife and myself have received repeated numerous phone calls, threatening me. When I would answer the phone I would be told that I had better not make any move to say anything or do anything against anybody in the Communist Party.

In some cases later on they simply would be annoying, simply calling up at home, or at the office, and I would answer the telephone and say

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"hello", or my wife would, and then they would hang up. There would be three, four, five or six of those things in a row so it didn't seem to be coincidence.

Q. Over how long a period did this happen?

A. Over a period of three weeks.

Q. That was after you made your statement to the FBI officers?

A. After I made my statement to the FBI officers in Seattle I received one such call only. It was before that most of them occurred.

Q. Are you married? A. Yes.

Q. Have you any children? A. One.

Q. How old is the child? [1494]

A. He is two years old; two years old tomorrow.

Q. Are you the sole support of your wife and child? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Joe Ring?

A. Yes, I know a Joe Ring.

Q. Who is he?

A. Joe Ring was one of the men who attended these Top Fraction meetings that I have described of the Communist Party in the Maritime Industry in San Francisco. He was Bridges' bodyguard. He would follow Bridges about to protect Bridges.

Q. Was he also a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes; he could not have been present at these Top Fraction meetings unless he were.

Presiding Inspector: The name, please?

Mr. Del Guercio: Joe Ring—B-i-n-g.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: You may take the witness.

Mr. Gladstein: May we have a few seconds, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Honig, you mentioned the book incident. You say you paid for the book?

A. No, I didn't say a book; I said some books.

Q. Some books? A. Yes. [1495]

Q. Did you pay for the books?

A. What did you say?

Q. Did you pay for the books?

A. Yes, I paid for them.

Q. Before or after the incident that you described when you were taken down to the police station?

A. After—in the police station.

Q. In the police station? A. Yes.

Q. Had you ever done anything like that before? A. No.

Q. Are you sure? A. Yes.

Q. On the day that happened weren't you advised that on the previous day you had taken some books for which you had not paid and that you were followed to your home by representatives of the store detectives in the store from which you took the books?

A. I was never advised anything about that. The only time I heard about such an event was in

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

a paper published in Seattle, the Washington New Dealer, and I had been informed that the same version of it appeared, not to my very great surprise, in the Peoples World here in San Francisco.

As to being followed to my home on the day before, or the same day, I couldn't possibly have been followed to my home because I worked at the Post-Intelligencer on both those days. [1496]

When I came from my home to the city—incidentally, I hadn't been home but had been staying at somebody else's home because my wife was out of town—but call that temporary abode my home—when I came from there, which was outside the city limits, I didn't go back home until 12:30 or 1:00 in the morning because that was when my shift ended at my place of work. So I could not have been followed home on the day before because I didn't go home once I came to the city.

Q. At the time that you were taken to the police station around that time, were you told by any representative of the store that was involved that you had been trailed by store detectives the previous day.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to this line of testimony. It isn't proper cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. It goes to his credibility.

By the way, you brought it out.

Mr. Del Guercio: What?

Presiding Inspector: You brought it out.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. No, I was not.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Or any prior day? [1497]

A. I was not told that I had been trailed.

Q. Did you have a conversation with representatives of the store on the day that you were taken to the police station?

A. Representatives of the store in which this occurred?

Q. Yes.

A. A conversation with reference to these particular books?

Q. Yes.

A. No; not with representatives of the store but of the store detective agency, or whatever it is called.

Q. You did have a conversation with them?

A. Yes.

Q. What did they say?

A. I don't remember their exact words. They said that two books that I had, they thought I was trying to take from the store.

I said, "I will pay for the books."

They told me, "No. We will have to get in touch with the police detective."

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

They sent for him and he came.

I asked them to take me to the place where I worked so that I could show the people, tell them, that my intentions, so far as they knew, was to pay for the books.

They said "No." They said that they couldn't do that; that they would have to call this police detective and see what he [1498] wanted to do.

He came and he said "We will go down and investigate this man and see if he has a record and see if there is anything against him."

So I was taken to the police station in Seattle. An investigation was made. They took my finger prints, recorded them. They found that there was no record and they gave me back the finger prints.

I paid this police detective for the books, which I had offered to do in the store, and I paid him there. He held the books for me and I came back and got them the next day from him.

I was not arrested and was not charged.

Q. Where did you make the offer to the store detective to pay for the books; inside the store or outside the store?

A. Inside the store.

Q. Are you sure about that?

A. Absolutely; in an office, in one of the offices in the store.

Q. Had you gone out of the store before you were taken to the office of the store by the store detective?

A. I was at the — this particular store, called Frederick & Nelson, is a place where they sell

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

magazines near the entrance to the store. I was there when I had the books. I was looking at the magazines. I was approached by these store detectives there. [1499]

Q. Did you have the books in your hand?

A. I had the books in my hand.

Q. Were you outside the store at the time?

A. When I was approached by them I was at this portion of the store where these magazines were.

Q. Were you leaving the store?

A. I was looking at the magazines.

Q. This is outside the doorway of the store, is it?

A. I would say it is part of the entrance to the store.

Q. Where are you now employed?

A. Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

Q. How long have you occupied that position?

A. You didn't ask me what position so I can't answer.

Q. How long have you been employed with that newspaper?

A. I have been employed as part time copy reader for the past three years. This is now the third year.

Q. This is continuous employment with the Post-Intelligencer?

A. I say part time.

Q. Are you now a part-time employee?

A. Yes.

Q. This would run back for the last three years?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. It extends back over the last three years, including this as one of the years.

Q. That is including 1941, you mean?

A. That is now—this is now the third year.

[1500]

Q. In other words, it would date back to about the beginning of 1939?

A. Yes; it would date back to the opening, start of the summer vacation period there in 1939.

Q. Just prior to that how were you earning a living?

A. Just prior to that I had been employed on the Writers Project, for a few months in Seattle.

Q. Will you give us the date of that employment?

A. The Writers Project—the exact date I can't recall, but I think it was between September 1938 and March 1939.

Q. While you were on the Writers Project were you on relief or a known relief employee?

A. No. I had been certified for relief before that.

Q. Were you a relief employee during this period that you were on the Writers Project?

A. Well, I was told that to work on the Project I would have to be certified as being eligible for relief, though I received no relief, no cash relief.

Q. Then you were known as a relief employee, is that right?

A. Well, I was never called that, but I assume that is the technical title for it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Just prior to that, that is, we have gone back down to [1501] September, 1938—

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing): —how were you then gainfully employed if, at all?

A. For two months—oh, I guess, roughly between a period of June 1, 1938 and September—I wasn't employed at all for those two months.

Q. You were not employed? A. No.

Q. Were you on relief?

A. No. I applied for relief just for certification, so I could be employed on the Writers Project, but not for cash relief.

Q. Just prior to June, 1938, what were you doing?

A. I was Editor of the Timber Worker, the Official organ of the International Woodworkers of America.

Q. For how long?

A. From August, 1937 to June, 1938.

Mr. Gladstein: I notice it is after 4:00. Of course, we can't finish today.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead for about five minutes longer. We have had pretty long recesses.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. So, during any of the period from August, 1937, to [1502] date has your wife also been employed?

A. She was employed—of course, she wasn't my

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

wife when I first came to the Timber Worker. We were married in May, 1938. From May, 1938—from that time, I guess—I mean, the period we were married, she perhaps was employed for a few weeks at the office of the International Woodworkers of America; specifically in the Timber Worker office. She had worked there before that, but that was before we were married.

Q. For a few weeks you say?

A. For a few weeks after we were married, yes. But she had worked there for a few months before we were married.

Q. And then I understand that she ceased working there, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Has she had any employment since that time?

A. Oh, she has had a day's work when somebody would ask her to do some stenography from time to time.

Q. During the period when you were on relief, that is, when you were on the Writer's Project as a relief client,—

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing): —were you doing any work in private employment?

A. I got one leave of absence of two weeks with the agreement of the Writer's Project there to do some work on the Post-Intelligencer on the copy desk; and then another day—I can't remember the exact time—I think I got two day's leave of [1503] absence. I am not sure of that, though.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

But I am pretty sure it is so, for the same purpose.

Q. Your recollection is that on one occasion you got a leave of absence for two weeks to do some work on the copy desk of the Post-Intelligencer?

A. Yes.

Q. And that on another occasion you had a two-day leave of absence for the same purpose?

A. Yes. I am not absolutely sure of the second occasion, but I think it was so.

Q. That is your recollection? A. Yes.

Q. Are you sure of the first?

A. Absolutely.

Q. The work that you were doing for the Post-Intelligencer *Post-Intelligencer*, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that remunerative? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Were you paid for that?

A. I was paid for that.

Q. Did you report those earnings to the WPA?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And were deductions made from your WPA wages on account of those earnings? [1504]

A. No deductions were made. I simply didn't work at the Project for that period and received no wages for that period. There was a leave of absence from the Project without pay. That's the arrangement they had.

Q. Well, would it be correct to say during all the time that you were employed on the Writer's Project you did report to the official authorities

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

of that Project all earnings in private employment that you during that period made? A. Yes.

Q. That is correct?

A. Such reports were submitted by every member working on the Project periodically. I reported whatever earnings I made.

Q. Have you mentioned all the arrests to which you have ever been subjected? A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever given false testimony under oath? A. No.

Q. I want to go back to this for just a moment. Since May, 1938, when you became married, is it correct that your wife's only employment has been for the few weeks, as you described it, in the Timber Worker's office? A. The only thing—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): If your Honor please, the testimony is that she got occasional jobs. They were stenographic jobs. Now, Counsel knows that. [1505]

Mr. Gladstein: Oh, is it?

Presiding Inspector: He said that.

Mr. Gladstein: Oh, excuse me.

Q. Can you name any places where she has worked?

A. The Pacific Coast Labor Bureau. I think that's about the only place she got any other work. They would call her up to do some stenography when they wanted something gotten out in a hurry.

Q. During what period of time? Can you date it?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I couldn't exactly, no. I could make a stab at that. I believe some of that work was in 1939, in January or February or March, a part of that work in all three of those months. It was sometimes two days' work, sometimes maybe three days', once perhaps a week or four days that week. Whenever they had to get out, oh, some long document pertaining to their particular work, they would call her.

Q. Well now, there is a rule, is there not, in connection with the Writer's Project that you are required to report to the authorities of the Writer's Project any earnings that you make in private employment?

A. Any earnings that I make in private employment.

Q. And you say that you complied with that rule at all times? A. Yes.

Q. Is there also a rule that you are required to report [1506] any earnings that your wife makes during the period that you are on the Writer's Project?

A. I knew of no such rule and I don't even recall whether, despite the fact that there wasn't to my knowledge any such rule—I think I may have mentioned it or told the person in charge there, but the only rule I know of is that periodically we would be given a slip which asked us and said that the rule was that you must report what outside earnings you yourself had made in that period. I know that I was never asked to report earnings

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

that anybody else in my family or anybody connected with me had made. This is the only thing, and we were all given this at a regular period. I forgot how often. I think it was quarterly.

Q. You say, however, that you think you did make some report as to your wife's earnings to the Writer's Project?

A. I am pretty sure I mentioned it to the person in charge, because we were friendly and he had met my wife and he knew—

Q. (Interposing). When you say "mentioned" you don't mean—

A. (Interposing). Not in an official report, no. I didn't because I was never asked to make any report on anything but my own.

Q. The earnings, however, that you made in private employment you not only mentioned but you made a report—an [1507] official report—did you?

A. I made a written, signed report on that, yes, at regular intervals.

Mr. Gladstein: Does your Honor wish to convene? I was going to go to another subject matter.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. We had better recess until tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 o'clock P.M., an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10:00 o'clock A.M.) [1508]

Court Room 276,
Federal Building,
San Francisco, California,

April 22, 1941.

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A.M.

[1509]

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: Call the witness back.

Mr. Gladstein: Are you ready, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

NAT HONIG

called as a witness on behalf of the Government,
having been previously duly sworn, testified further
as follows:

Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Honig, do you remember the titles of the
books that you took from this store, Frederick &
Nelson?

A. Mr. Gladstein seems to be very eager—

Presiding Inspector: Don't argue. Answer the
question.

The Witness: I wanted to go into—

Presiding Inspector: No, you don't go into
anything. You are not conducting this proceeding.
There are counsel here and I am presiding.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: Excuse me.

Presiding Inspector: Answer the question "yes" or "no". Do you know the names of the books?

A. I don't recall the titles of the books you refer to off-hand.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, yesterday I believe we went back to the time that you went on the Writers Project. I believe you said that was in September of 1938?

[1510]

A. Yes, I believe I did.

Q. And just prior to that time I think you said for a couple of months you were unemployed from approximately June to September 1938, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then just prior to that, from a period dating from August 1937 until June 1938, you were with the Timber Worker?

A. Yes, approximately.

Q. Why did you leave the Timber Worker?

A. I believe I left the Timber Worker—I was dismissed from the Timber Worker at the orders of Mr. Pritchett, International President of the International Woodworkers of America.

Q. For what were you dismissed?

A. It is a detailed story. I will go into it the best way I can.

Q. Before you do that—

Presiding Inspector: You have asked it. Go ahead.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A: Yes. No reason was given, no official reason was given for what I was dismissed for. I had been a delegate to a Guild International Convention in Toronto, and when I returned I found I was called in by Mr. Orton, Vice President of the Timber Worker, and he said that due to the fact that we had numerous disagreements in discussing policies, and in what was to go into the paper, that they had found it advisable to replace [1511] me with somebody else.

I asked him, I reminded him that before I had left for the convention that I had told him I wanted to resign; and that he had taken me to Mr. Rapport's office and that they both had asked me not to resign; that they couldn't get anybody to replace me.

"Well," I said, "in that case I would be willing to date my resignation as of September 1st if they could get a man to replace me."

They said, "Suppose you just think it over. You go back to the Guild Convention and you think it over. But you find a man to take your place while you are at the Guild Convention in Toronto." This I did.

I went back. When I returned I found this man had been appointed to take my place by Pritchett and Orton. [1512]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Who was that man?

A. Louis Huber; H-u-b-e-r.

Q. Were you not dismissed for incompetency?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. No, such reason was ever given to me, and, in point of fact, a letter was sent to the paper by John L. Lewis, the International President of the CIO, calling the paper the best union paper he had seen or one of the best union papers he had seen in any of the CIO Internationals, and that letter was actually reproduced and printed on the first page of the Timber Worker at Pritchett's request.

Q. Then it would be correct to say that you regarded the dismissal as entirely unjust and unfounded?

A. I would. I regarded it as so.

Q. Did you in connection with that threaten to "get" any of the people whom you regarded as responsible for the loss of your job?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever make a statement that you would "get" any of those persons if it was the last thing you did?

A. I recall no such statement that I made.

Q. Would you say that you did or did not make it?

A. I did not make it, to the best of my memory.

Q. We are back now to August, 1937, at the time that you went on the Timber Worker. What was your employment just [1513] prior to that.

A. Well, just prior to that I was in Seattle, for about a month. I had been sent for by Rapport, the District Secretary of the Communist Party, and he told me to come immediately; that I would be made Editor of the Timber Worker. When

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I came he said that they had not been able to arrange a meeting of the Executive Board of the International Wood Workers of America and that they would have it any day, and that I would sit around and meanwhile the Communist Party would see that I had money to live on, and so forth. Well, that "any day" developed into about three weeks or a month before they finally got the Executive Board together to meet.

Q. How long?

A. Oh, it was about three weeks or so anyway, approximately. And when they did meet I was sent for by the Executive Board, which interviewed me, and then I was appointed by vote of the Executive Board to be Editor of the Timber Worker.

Q. Did you make a written application for the position?

A. I believe I did.

Q. To the Timber Worker?

A. To the Timber Worker.

Q. All right. Now, just before you went—

A. (Interposing) To the International Woodworkers' Executive Board.

Q. Just before you went to Seattle, then, which as you say is about a month prior to the time that you got the job [1514] with the Timber Worker, where were you employed?

A. San Francisco, on the Western Worker.

Q. That would be, in other words, ending about June or July of 1937?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. I think it was probably June; early in June.

Q. And how long had you been employed just before that continuously with the Western Worker?

A. Well, employed on a salary basis?

Q. Well, how long had you been employed, first of all?

A. I had been connected with the Western Worker since April, 1935.

Q. Continuously until June, 1937?

A. Yes, approximately June.

Q. Part of that time, you say, you were recompensed and in part you were not? A. Yes.

Q. Well, during what period were you paid for your work and during what period were you not paid for your work?

A. It would be impossible to give any regular period because a great deal of the time you might get enough money to have, say, a meal for one day, other times you might get \$15.00 for that week, other times you might get \$5.00, other times \$10.00, many weeks nothing. And it wasn't a question of any long sustained period where you either got some money or either didn't get some money. [1515]

Q. During the period of your employment, whether you were recompensed or not, with the Western Worker did you do your work during all of that time in San Francisco?

A. Yes. Occasionally. I would go out of town to cover some story.

Q. How far out of town would you go?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Well, for instance, once I went to Sacramento for a day or two to cover some conference. I forget which it was. That is one incident. Once I went down to Los Angeles to cover some conference down there. I forget what they were exactly.

Q. Did you ever go out of the State of California during that period April, 1935, to June, '37 when you were with the Western Worker?

A. No. I never left the State in all that period.

Q. At any time during your employment with the Western Worker were you on a regular salary? Let's put it this way, first of all:—

A. (Interposing). Yes.

Q. (Continuing) —when you did get a salary, what did it come to?

A. It was supposed to be a salary of \$10.00 per week. That was the understanding when I came there. They stated that. "Well, we pay the members of the staff \$10.00 a week." The District Secretary, Schneidermann, told me this. [1516]

Q. All right. Could you strike an average, say, half of the time, a part of the time, or three quarters of the time that you were with the Western Worker that you received this weekly salary?

A. You mean an average, that would come to a ten dollars a week?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

Q. Or whatever you were supposed to get. I understand from you that you were supposed to get \$10.00 a week.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. Well, I could only strike a pretty rough average.

Q. Your best judgment.

A. Yes, my best judgment. Oh, possibly somewhat less than half of the time; possibly a little more than that, but about that.

Q. About half of the time?

A. I would guess that, yes.

Q. During any of that period, Mr. Honig, were you on relief? A. Yes, in San Francisco.

Q. For how much of the period?

A. I don't remember the exact period. I think it was a question of perhaps anywhere from six weeks to two and a half, three months. But that, too, is a rough guess. That was, [1517] oh, five or six years ago.

Q. Were you on relief under your own name?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make reports to the relief—withdraw that. A. Yes, you had to.

Q. Just a moment! During the time you were on relief were you receiving any money from the Western Worker?

A. No. We were told—I know I was—that in order to save the Communist Party paying your salary out of the Communist Party's own money, it would be possible and it would be good advice and a good idea to apply for relief and thus be able to have sustenance, money for sustenance. And we were also told—and this was told me by Schneidermann himself, the District Secretary,—that there

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

were plenty of Party members, plenty of comrades in the relief set-up to see to it that there would be no difficulty in that.

Q. What difficulty are you talking about?

A. Well, the difficulty in the sense of this: That you wouldn't have to say that the Party had told you that they were going to discontinue paying you the money, your salary, for the period that you are on relief; and all you had to say was "Yes, you are working at the Western Worker, you are helping out voluntarily without salary", and to state that frankly; and that the chances are almost anybody that you struck, any visitor for the relief service, would understand that as soon as you [1518] mentioned that.

Q. That was Mr. Schneiderman who told you?

A. Yes; words to that effect.

Q. Now, at any time while you were on relief in San Francisco, and I am now talking about the period from April 1935 to June 1937, did you report to the relief authorities any earnings that you made while you were on the Western Worker?

A. I didn't make any earnings, at any of the time that I received relief, from the Western Worker.

Q. Is it your testimony then that you did not make any report of earnings to the relief authorities?

A. No. I wasn't requested to make a report of earnings, but had I been—I don't recall any request

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

—had I been requested I would have stated the facts; that I was not earning any salary.

Q. First, let's get an answer to this: It is true that you did not make any report to the relief authorities of any earnings in private employment, or the Western Worker?

Presiding Inspector: He answered that question.

Mr. Gladstein: He has said that—

Presiding Inspector: He answered the question. Ask the next question. He has given a negative answer.

Mr. Gladstein: All right. If your Honor is satisfied that the record is that way it is all right.

Presiding Inspector: I have no doubt about it in my mind. [1519]

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I think you said yesterday that when you came to San Francisco to work on the Western Worker you were first assigned as Labor Editor?

A. Yes; as make-up man, Labor Editor—I wasn't given a title; I was given the work what is called on regular daily papers as News Editor.

Q. Your main function at that time was to act as Labor Editor?

A. Yes. I reported labor news.

Q. I think you said yesterday that you held that position for four or five months?

A. Yes; I held that position for, that is, solely that position, as far as titles around the office were

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

concerned, solely that title for about four or five months; or perhaps it was six months. I don't remember exactly. But it was around that approximate period. But when I became Managing Editor I also continued to handle labor news for a period.

Q. When you became Managing Editor did some other person assume the title and duties of Labor Editor?

A. A little later I had to break in somebody to become Labor Editor, to handle that after I gave it up.

Q. Is it correct then that when you changed from Labor Editor to Managing Editor you broke in somebody else to take over [1520] the position of Labor Editor? A. Yes.

Q. How long was that breaking-in process?

A. Oh, I guess it would take about three weeks to a month. I had to take the person around to the Central Labor Council and show him the ropes on covering the Council, and various things of that sort.

Q. Thereafter that person became the Editor?

A. He was understood to be the Labor Editor.

Q. Was he?

A. He was, but he handled the labor news.

Q. And did he continue to handle the labor news as Labor Editor thereafter while you were with the Western Worker?

A. I believe practically the entire time thereafter he did.

Q. Yesterday Mr. Del Guercio asked you about

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

the Trade Union Unity League and its connection with the Red International of Labor Unions. Were the two affiliated?

A. The Trade Union Unity League was affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions.

Q. Was it through that affiliation, or brought by reason of that affiliation, that you yesterday said the Red International of Labor Unions dominated and controlled the Trade Union Unity League?

A. Controlled, rather, decided its major policies; yes, [1521] sir.

Q. By virtue of that affiliation?

A. By virtue of that affiliation.

Q. During any of the time that you were connected with the Trade Union Unity League—with draw that. First of all, would it be correct to say that your connection with the Trade Union Unity League continued until the time you came out to the West Coast?

A. No, no; that is not correct.

Q. When did it end?

A. It ended at the time I sailed for the Soviet Union.

Q. All right. Now, prior to that time—put it this way: Up to the time that your connection with the Trade Union Unity League ended—

A. (Interposing) Incidentally, I couldn't say that even then because in all in my period in the Soviet Union I still was connected with the Trade Union Unity League.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Let me ask first, when your connection with the Trade Union Unity League began?

A. In probably March 1930, I believe the first issue of Labor Unity, the official organ of the TUUL, that I got out was the issue dated March 30, or something like that, 1930.

A. And did your connection continue thereafter continuously until the time that you left for the Soviet Union, or shortly thereafter? [1522]

A. My connection as Editor of Labor Unity continued until the day I sailed for the Soviet Union.

Q. All right. During that period of time did disaffiliation occur between the Trade Union Unity League and the Red International of Labor Unions?

Presiding Inspector : I didn't get the word.

Mr. Gladstein: "Disaffiliation".

A. No formal disaffiliation occurred. It was decided, I believe, perhaps six months or eight months before I sailed for the Soviet Union, that we would drop from, for instance, the masthead of Labor Unity, it might have been before that, but some time much later after I became Editor of Labor Unity anyway, we would drop the line in the masthead of Labor Unity "Affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions," and that in any future pamphlets or publications gotten out by the Trade Union Unity League, or sponsored by the Labor Unity, that any mention of that affiliation would be dropped; not denying it, but simply dropping any reference to it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Then is that the only thing that happened that would indicate disaffiliation, or an effort at it?

Mr. Del Guercio: That isn't what the witness said would indicate disaffiliation.

Mr. Gladstein: I am asking him whether there is anything else that took place to indicate disaffiliation.

Presiding Inspector: His interpretation isn't of course, [1523] material. I think the witness understands what is asked.

→ A. There wasn't anything that actually occurred to indicate disaffiliation, because I remember the meeting of the—or, it was taken up at several meetings of the National Executive Board of the TUUL, where it was distinctly stressed they were still to be affiliated with the Red International of Trade Unions, and would continue to send representatives to the Red International of Trade Unions, but we were to simply drop reference to that in connection in any publications.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Well, then, your testimony would be that there was no disaffiliation?

A. My testimony is that there was no disaffiliation while I was Editor of Labor Unity.

Q. You say your name is Nat Honig?

A. Nat Honig is the name I am known by; yes.

Q. You are not Nathaniel Honig?

A. Nathan Honig, Nathaniel Honig, Nate Honig—they are the same; yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Were you editor of Labor Unity in October 1933? A. Yes.

Q. And I think, as you said, a member, by virtue of that position, of the Executive Board of the Trade Union Unity League? A. Yes. [1524]

Q. Do you remember testifying as a witness in a case entitled Chatham Shoe Company against Shoe Workers Industrial Union?

A. Yes, I testified in a—I don't remember the name of the case, but it was a shoe case.

Q. Do you remember that that trial took place before Mr. Justice Edward J. McGoldrick?

A. I don't remember the—

Presiding Inspector: McGoldrick—M-c-G-o-l-d-r-i-c-k.

Br. Gladstein: Thank you.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. That took place in October 1933, didn't it?

A. I think it did; I am not sure of the date.

Q. Isn't it true that in that case you appeared as a witness and you testified under oath in substance, that beginning with July 1, 1933, or approximately at that time, the Trade Union Unity League had discontinued and severed its affiliation with the Red International of Labor Unions?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute, if your Honor please. It appears that counsel is reading from something and that the witness should see it.

Presiding Inspector: Show him the testimony.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't have the testimony.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

This is just a note of my own to refresh my recollection.

Presiding Inspector: You don't have to show him that. [1525] A. Yes——

Mr. Gladstein: You say "yes"?

Presiding Inspector: I don't think that was an answer to the question.

The Witness: I meant "yes", I am going to answer the question.

What I testified there——

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. (Interposing) No, no, no.

Presiding Inspector: He asked whether you did testify as he has suggested?

A. No, I did not testify in those words.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you testify to that in substance and effect?

A. No; not in that substance and effect.

Q. You are sure of that?

A. Yes. I remember distinctly what I testified when I was sent there to testify.

Q. Did you ever learn after your testimony in that case that the Department of Labor of the United States, in partial reliance, at least, upon your testimony in that case, made the determination that membership in the Trade Union Unity League was not a deportable offense in view of the disaffiliation that had occurred between the Trade Union Unity League and the Red International of Labor Unions? [1526]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that. That is a conclusion of the attorney. There is no such ruling.

Presiding Inspector: I will exclude that. [1527]

Mr. Gladstein: It may be that the witness knows, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: He couldn't know.

Mr. Del Guercio: How could he know?

Mr. Gladstein: Suppose he says that he does know and was in a position to obtain information? He could have been notified personally, for all we know, and I understand from him—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Supposing he were notified? You mean officially by the Labor Department?

Mr. Gladstein: They might have. I don't know. It may be that he was.

Presiding Inspector: Ask him that, then.

Were you ever notified of any such decision? Yes or no.

The Witness: No.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. To your knowledge was the organization, that is, the Trade Union Unity League, ever notified of any such decision?

A. Not to my knowledge, no.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it is material anyway.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, we think it is, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I think not. And

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

what I think is of more importance just now. It may not be ultimately, but it is just now.

By Mr. Gladstein: [1528]

Q. What did you testify to in that case?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, that is a broad question.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I sustain the objection.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What did you testify with reference to the question of disaffiliation between the Trade Union Unity League and the Red International of Labor Unions?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that question.

Presiding Inspector: I sustain that objection.

Mr. Gladstein: May I be heard on that one?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I have asked the witness whether he testified in substance and effect in a certain way concerning a particular subject. The witness says that he did not testify that way on that subject. I am now asking him how he did testify.

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps he didn't testify on that subject. Why don't you ask him that?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I will ask him that question.

Presiding Inspector: Ask him first whether he testified on the subject of disassociation.

Mr. Del Guercio: If he wants to show inconsistent

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

statements, I think the rule is that he should confront the [1529] witness.—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) There may be a record of them or not. This is an oral statement. If the trial wasn't printed it would probably be lost in the surge of time.

Mr. Del Guercio: Shouldn't that be determined first?

Presiding Inspector: Oh, I don't think so. This is a very collateral point.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will ask you now, Mr. Honig—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Ask him whether he testified on the subject of "disaffiliation," if there is any such word.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will ask you now in the case that we have been talking about, the Chatham Shoe case in 1933, you did testify on the question of disaffiliation of the Trade Union Unity League from the Red International of Labor Unions.

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment! I object to that as having already been asked and answered.

Presiding Inspector: I think not.

Mr. Del Guercio: Two or three times.

Presiding Inspector: I think not. I will allow it.

A. I testified as to the relationship of the TUUL with the RILU. Yes, the question of disaffiliation or not disaffiliation would be part of what I testified about. [1530]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What in substance was your testimony on the question of disaffiliation?

A. I testified to the effect—I can't give exact words, of course—to the effect, in substance, that the literature, the current literature of the Trade Union Unity League, literature then in use, did not show affiliation of the TUUL with the Red International of Labor Unions. That was the substance, to the best of my recollection.

Q. Well, did you intend by your testimony to give the impression that—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Certainly I object to that.

Mr. Gladstein: I haven't finished the question. I have a right to finish the question before we have the "jumping jack." If your Honor please, I would like to be able to finish the question.

Presiding Inspector: No, I don't think—it sounded as though you might have finished.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think so.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see any reason to chastise Mr. Del Guercio for that. Go ahead and ask the rest of the question.

Mr. Del Guercio: May I say something, too?

Presiding Inspector: No, not until he has finished [1531] his question. Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Honig, in the testimony that you gave on the question of disaffiliation—

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Don't answer that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. (Continuing) —did you intend to give the impression that disaffiliation had occurred?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that upon the ground that—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I will allow that.

A. No, I merely intended to show as a factual—as a matter of fact that the literature, the current literature of the Trade Union Unity League did not refer to any such affiliation. That is, most of the literature then being used. At the same time I was shown literature that still was in circulation in the Trade Union Unity League relating to the program—this is to the best of my memory, it is quite a long time ago. I was shown literature, I believe, by the Court which still did refer to such affiliation with the RILU and I was asked if I could identify that as having been published by the TUUL or the Labor Unions, as the case may be, and I did so identify it. But I pointed out that this was not the literature, the latest literature showing the program, policy and so forth.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is it correct, then, that you drew a distinction in [1532] your testimony between the literature of the Trade Union Unity League prior to a certain period in which there was mention of a connection

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

or affiliation, on the one hand, and literature after that certain period in which there was no mention of any such affiliation?

A. No, not that kind of a distinction. The distinction I was trying, at least in my way, to draw there, was a distinction of date of publication of the literature. I was just simply trying to show that this literature was published later than that literature and that, therefore, this was more current.

Q. When did you leave the Communist Party?

A. November of 1939 is when I notified the leading members of my party unit that I was leaving.

Q. Could you briefly state the essence of your basic reason for leaving the Communist Party?

A. Yes. I thought I stated yesterday. I tried to in the best way I could, but I can do it again.

The first reason in my mind for making me leave was the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact. That had been signed about a month and a half before or two months before that. I believe it was late in August of that year and I tried to figure the thing out; talked to other party members, tried to get their opinion, tried to see if it could jibe in any way with the principles that I believed in and with the ideals and principles that I had in all my time in the Party believed that the Party stood for as far as Fascism was concerned. And I tried and I tried to see every side of the question. I talked to Party leaders, from Rapport down. I talked to ordinary rank-and-file Party members to get every kind of reaction, explanation and every facet of the question

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

before I wanted to make up my mind, because I had been in the Party a long time and I didn't want to leave just overnight on a snap decision after I had been in it for a long time. But finally I couldn't see that the signing of that Pact and the consequent change in policy, being another change in policy in the American Party could be anything but a complete reversal of everything that I had stood for and thought the Party stood for in relationship to Fascism.

Q. Did you feel then that,——

A. (Interposing) That was one reason.

Q. Oh, all right. Was that the most important reason?

A. I would say that ——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) I think he gave all the reasons yesterday. They are on direct. Do we want to go over all that again?

Presiding Inspector: I suppose he has the right to go over them.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was that the most important reason? [1534]

A. This and the next reason I am going to give, it was a tie between them for importance in my mind.

The next reason was that I felt, particularly in my experiences with Party members who are officials of the I. W. A., the International Woodworkers, that their role in the trade unions when they achieved leading positions was an opportunist role. This was something, too, that I thought for a long time. I

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

can't say that it suddenly came to me. I can't say that I just suddenly became aware of that. It was something that began to disturb me quite a bit from almost the—well, I won't say from almost the day I began to serve as Editor of the Timber Worker, but pretty nearly that.

There were certain things that occurred that I couldn't understand a man, a Communist Party member, who subscribed to a supposedly program of leading the workers into more militant and progressive channels of struggle doing.

The thing that really was the pay-off for me there was the fact that while there were three thousand or so workers locked out in Portland—International Woodworkers' members—starving and we were collecting relief for them, well, men like Pritchett would take trips back East and spend several hundred dollars in expenses on that, and at times fly back, when it seemed to me that they could have saved a lot of that money and they could have achieved whatever they went there for with- [1535] out spending that much money.

Then there were other things, too: I mentioned, for instance, the disagreements I had in connection with what went into the Timber Worker. They were not disagreements on basic policy of the International Woodworkers or even the question of policy of the Communist Party in the trade unions so much.

The first thing that—there were disagreements on this: The first thing I tried to do when I became

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Editor of the *Timber Worker* was to establish as much space as possible for letters from the members of the unions so they could express themselves on anything they wanted. So I built that up to a two-page section out of eight pages.

Naturally, there were many members of the International Woodworkers that didn't agree with the International officials. They didn't like the Communist Party also. There were many who, quite a number who, did like the officials and did like the Communist Party.

Well, letters would come in for those rank-and-file pages. I called them "the voice of the rank-and-file"—from both sides and, as far as space permitted, tried to equalize them because the letters generally were equal in proportion.

I was criticised very severely, not first by Pritchett, who was the International President of the Union, but I was called to Morris Rapport's office, the District Organizer, or District Secretary of the Communist Party, and told that I [1536] was devoting too much space to letters which criticised the Communist Party and the officials of the International Woodworkers. I told him that these were the men who were paying for the paper; that we couldn't possibly refuse to print their letters; we had no right to. And, I said, 'So long as I am Editor, so long as I am permitted to remain Editor I am going to try to continue that policy.'

The International Executive Board had endorsed that policy as far as the paper was concerned at

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

successive meetings and they never had ordered me to not continue doing that.

Then another time what happened was this. Two Communist Party leaders—they were openly and admittedly Communist Party leaders—came to Seattle to make a talk. I forget the occasion. I think it was the anniversary of the Russian Revolution on November 7th. They were C. A. Hathaway and William F. Dunne. And the Communist Party had gotten the use of the Civic Auditorium, which is run by the City of Seattle. Later on the city officials denied the use, revoked the permit to use the auditorium for the Communist Party.

I was called to Rapport's office and I was told to make a "big issue" in the Timber Worker, which was a union paper and not the Communist Party organ. I agreed there should be something in the paper about it, and for that issue I wrote an article saying that in my opinion that, if the city-owned [1537] auditorium was denied to any political group, it could later be denied perhaps as a precedent to a union group. And I made it a question of that.

When the issue came out I was sent for by Rapport, Pritchett and Orton, the International Vice-President, who were in Rapport's office, and I was told that from the Communist Party point of view I had committed a greivous error and a blunder, and so forth and so on down the line. I was told that I should have made that a downright issue of the right of the Communist Party to use the civic auditorium and never mind the question of whether

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

it be the Union's, or not, to make it a downright question of the civil liberties of the Communist Party. And I told them that I didn't want to do that because it was not a Communist Party newspaper. And from then on I noticed less and less cooperation from Prichett and Orton as far as writing articles for the paper, as far as assisting me in my work, which was the duties of the International officers.

These things led to my resignation, my telling them that I wanted to resign and the rest of what I told you before.

Q. Have you now stated all the basic or important or fundamental reasons why you left the Communist Party?

A. Those two and one more, and that is the complete lack of democracy in the Communist Party. There had been some democracy in earlier days among the rank-and-file members of the Party and in the Party units, but gradually the last three [1538] years I was in the Party that began to dwindle down to the point where it was non-existent.

For instance, no officials of the Communist Party were actually elected by the rank-and-file members before their assuming their positions. A slate would be submitted to a Communist Party Convention and then you were told to vote on that slate. You didn't have any other slate to vote on. It was like voting "Yes." And, as a matter of fact, at Communist Party Conventions that I attended, if you abstained from voting even, you were severely criticised be-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

cause that meant that you had a mental reservation against the slate that the Party leadership wanted to be in those posts.

In the Party units particularly I noticed at the time of the signing of that Soviet-German pact, the thing was handed down to the Party members as an accomplished fact and you were told "You have to accept this as a policy now." And many Party members couldn't understand it and said "Well, only two days ago at meetings we were handed outlines for discussion on Democracy and how we should fight to defend Democracy, now we are told to forget Democracy; that it is an implement of the bourgeoisie and of the capitalists. There was no democratic determination of that policy by the Party membership.

Q. Have you now stated all the reasons why you left the Communist Party?

A. I think I have stated the basic reasons. [1539]

Q. Is it not a fact that you yourself believed in the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?

A. I had to believe that—yes, I did. I necessarily believed that in a major part of the time that I was in the Party as a Party member.

Q. You do now, don't you? A. I do not.

Q. When did you stop believing that?

A. I stopped believing that as far as my own mind was concerned, oh, perhaps a year and a half, two years before I left the Party. And, as a matter of fact, I discussed that with Party officials and I

(Testimony of Nat Honigs).

had told them that—I had told them that I was coming to think that such kind of action to achieve social change would not be necessary, and I pointed out to certain reforms being made by the National Administration. And they said—they pointed out “Well, you don’t necessarily have to believe that. It’s quite possible that in the United States”—this was not writings, this was in personal conversations with me—“It is quite possible in the United States and even probable that there wouldn’t have to be force and violence, because all the rest of the world would have done so meanwhile, and all the rest of the thing would fall in our laps”.

Well, that kind of sustained me, kept me in the Party for [1540] a while, plus the assurance of the leading members of the Communist Party.

Q. Then is it your testimony that from 1927, to approximately 1937 you did believe in the forcible and violent destruction of the Government of the United States?

A. I would put my belief in that period you mentioned in this way. What I believed was this: That—

Q. (Interposing) Can’t you first answer the question “Yes” or “No” and then, if you want to qualify it, you can make as many qualifications as you like?

Mr. Del Guercio: The witness has indicated that he can’t answer it “Yes” or “No”.

Presiding Inspector: I think he can answer it. Let’s see if he can answer it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. (Continuing) I don't believe I can definitely say "Yes" or "No" on that question.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. All right. If you can't say either "Yes" or "No", go ahead and speak.

A. What I believed from the day I joined the Communist Party, oh, for, say, the next nine or ten years was this: That the Communists could work as far as possible towards transition, towards socialization, in that quite possibly at some point when they got near the point, say, where the masses of people of the country were ready for a change in the system, [1541] for doing away with capitalism as a system, at that time they would be in such a great majority and indicate it so plainly that there might not be the necessity for any kind of struggle or violence.

I thought that there were maybe a 75 per cent chance that that could happen, and many Party leaders told me that. But I did believe this, however: That in case such a situation arose and the organization of the workers that were desirous of that change made it plain to those in control of capitalism that they wanted to achieve a system of socialization now, and if those in control of the capitalist organizations, the capital system as a whole, met them with violence then I did believe, and I sincerely believed that it would be necessary for the working class to resort to violence because they were being met with it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. That is counter-violence after violence first used by some other side?

A. Yes. That was really in my belief. But, nevertheless, I must say openly that it was a belief in the use of violence to achieve that aim.

Q. During the period that you have held the beliefs that you have just described did you consider your beliefs to be consistent or inconsistent with the teachings and advocacies of the Communist Party?

A. I believed them to be largely consistent because, [1542] first of all, I had discussed these questions with leading members of the Communist Party, men like Foster, men like Stachel, who were members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, and in cases even in some Communist writings it has been mentioned that in a country like the United States it might be possible that, well, the capitalists would have no fight left in them in this country because the capitalists in the other countries had been overcome. And I kind of rather like to choose to believe those statements rather than the contradictory statements on that subject appearing probably in the same work by men like Lenin and so forth. Perhaps it was just a matter of wishful thinking on my part.

Q. In what respect would you say that your present views on the subject we are now discussing are consistent or inconsistent with the views you held while you were in the Communist Party?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. You mean on the subject of violence?

Q. Yes.

A. In the use of violence. I believe now that it isn't—that it will not be necessary in order to achieve a better measure of social justice to use violence for, say, a change in—not—for a change in the way the Government operates and the way the entire system that we live under operates in respect to the people as a whole. [1543]

Q. Well, didn't you say a few moments ago that you believed that there was a 75 per cent chance—that is to say, while you were in the Communist Party you believed—that there would be no violence?

A. Yes, I said that when I was in the Communist Party for the first ten years or so. I understood your last question to refer to my beliefs now.

Q. Yes, your present belief.

A. Yes. At the present moment, yes.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is very clear. Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, you gave some testimony yesterday about the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

A. Yes. [1544]

Q. You say that was an affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League? A. Yes, that was.

Q. The Marine Workers Industrial Union, I think you said, if I am not mistaken about that—don't feel that I am putting words in your mouth, and you can simply say so—that the Marine Work-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

ers Industrial Union was not openly known as affiliated in any way with any organization in Russia?

A. I don't think I said that. The best of my recollection is that my testimony was that it was not openly known as being affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States. Maybe I am wrong about that, but that is what I meant to say.

Q. But what you meant was that there was no open affiliation between the Marine Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party?

A. Yes; as a matter of fact, no open connection of any kind.

Q. What about the connection of the Marine Workers Industrial Union with the Red International of Labor Unions? Was that an open one, say, take the period during the 1934 strike in San Francisco—what was the situation then?

A. That was an open connection up until the time, I believe you gave the date when you were speaking of my testimony in that Court in New York. Up to that time that was an open affiliation to the Red International of Trade Unions, through [1545] its affiliations with the TUUL. The affiliation of the Marine Workers Industrial Union with the TUUL was openly stated in the Marine Workers Industrial Union literature. In turn, the TUUL affiliation with the RILU was at that time also openly stated.

Q. Well, that period was some time in 1933, wasn't it?

(Testimony of Nat Honig)

A. If I remember right that period you mentioned, I think I agreed with that period; that it was up until then.

Q. What about after that period?

A. After that period the situation applied as I described later; that is, that it was decided that in all TUUL affiliates, and in connection with the TUUL itself, that as far as references in printed literature was concerned affiliation with the RILU, that would be removed from that literature; but that in all actuality such affiliation was not really done away with.

Q. Well, then, were efforts made after this period in October 1933 to openly show a disaffiliation?

A. The efforts that were made were these—it may actually mean what you are saying there—but the efforts actually made were these: Simply to remove any traces, not to deny, not to deny in the literature but I saw, anyway, or that I remember seeing off-hand, or at least there was a decision anyway—I can only speak on what the decision was at one of the meetings I attended of the TUUL Executive Board. The decision was not to make any efforts to deny in printed words [1546] that a disaffiliation had occurred between the TUUL and its affiliates, with the RILU; but simply in any new literature that was published from that time on, not to refer to any such affiliation.

Q. Was there an effort—

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Read the last answer, please, Mr. Reporter.

(The answer referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Presiding Inspector: Not to deny that a disaffiliation had occurred, is that what you mean?

The Witness: Yes. I would like to answer it a little more clearly. I guess it was rather mixed up there.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is.

The Witness: I would like to answer that with brevity. The decision made by the Trade Union Unity League Executive Board was to eliminate references in any new literature of the TUUL itself, or its affiliates, to the fact that the TUUL, or its affiliates, were connected in any way with the RILU; but not actually coming out in new literature and denying that. That was the decision made.

Presiding Inspector: Not to deny the affiliation?

The Witness: Yes; not to say in so many words that "We are not affiliated," but simply to revise the old literature.

Presiding Inspector: Say nothing about it?

[1547]

The Witness: Yes; that would sum it up.

Presiding Inspector: I think he has said it both ways now.

Mr. Gladstein: I think he has. It is a matter of taking one's choice.

Presiding Inspector: You said in the first statement, "Not to deny disaffiliation."

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: Not to deny affiliation.

Presiding Inspector: That is what you meant?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: I thought that was what you meant.

The Witness: I might have said it wrong, but that is what I meant.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, was the Marine Workers Industrial Union a bona fide trade union?

A. In form it was. It was a bona fide trade union in its structure and form; yes.

In answering that question I don't know if I can properly answer it without some kind of an accepted definition of what a bona fide trade union is.

Q. Put it this way: Did the Marine Workers Industrial Union attempt to organize workers in the Maritime Industry?

A. It did attempt to organize workers in the Maritime Industry.

Q. Did it organize any workers in the Maritime Industry? [1548]

A. Yes; it recruited members into its organization.

Q. Do you know at any period what its trade union membership was?

A. I can only state that roughly, because there would be varied claims made by various officials, by the MWIU. I know as an actual fact, as far as we who were members of the TUUL Executive

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Board, we knew without any hot air, and without trying to give an exaggerated impression for readers of our publication—I know as an actual fact, from our meetings, that the reports showed a maximum of maybe 3000 members or 4000 members at any one time in its first period of organization.

Later on there was one report made that it had got as many as 10,000 members, a thing never substantiated to my knowledge.

Q. Would you try to give us an approximate date as to the two periods you are talking about? You said in the first stages there were about 3000 members and then later on you said there were about 10,000.

A. I will try to give approximate dates. It is difficult, but I will try that; yes. I will do it this way. The Marine Workers Industrial Union was set up in 1933—I forget the month—and at the time it was set up it took into its organization and structure the entire Marine Workers Industrial League, which had been its predecessor. In that [1549] Marine Industrial League there were perhaps 2000 to 2500, maybe 3000, members. That in toto was taken over and became the Marine Workers Industrial Union. So that was actually my recollection of the initial membership in size. I think that was an actual membership.

Q. At what period did it achieve a membership of 10,000?

A. About a year later—this is also to the best of my recollection as to the date—about a year later

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

it began to lead a series of strikes and struggles, and early in 1934—maybe late in 1933—for one thing it led a series of strikes on individual ships, and strike action on individual ships. It did achieve some gains in those strikes for the members, some elementary gains.

Q. What kind of gains are you referring to now?

A. Well, better, perhaps, better sleeping quarters on a particular ship; maybe better food, or something like that. These were the elementary things that they would have disputes about in that stage of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Better wages?

A. I don't remember any occasion where wages were an issue, although they may have been.

Q. Shorter hours?

A. Shorter hours were a constant issue that was raised; the question of a three-watch system on a ship, which meant three watches a day, which meant an 8-hour day, or approximately [1550] so. But I don't know whether they actually made that a strike demand during that period.

Q. How about the manning scale? Do you know what I am referring to by that?

A. Yes. I think that was referred to. I know it was a part of the basic program of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, but I can't say definitely.

Q. What was a part of the basic program?

A. The question of wage scales generally was part of the basic program.

Q. I said "manning scale". Do you know what

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I mean by "manning scale"? I mean the number of men that are on a ship that occupy the various classifications of work to be performed?

A. I don't recall that being made an issue.

Q. You don't recall one of the issues made by the MWIU was to increase the number of men employed on the ship?

A. That was not raised on the east coast or the gulf coast. I was not familiar with the west coast then.

Q. What about the question of the abolition of employers' hiring halls and the establishment of Union hiring halls—was that an issue?

A. That was part of the basic program. In any dispute they would have they would bring that up.

Q. Did the Marine Workers Industrial Union exercise or [1551] exert any real influence in the 1934 Maritime strike in San Francisco?

A. I can only say that from what was discussed at the Executive Board meetings of the Trade Union Unity League. I wasn't on the West coast and I couldn't testify to the actual situation. I wasn't here. But in discussions at which I was present, Executive Board meetings of the TUUL, it was reported, whenever the maritime situation was discussed, particularly, the west coast maritime situation, that the MWIU had been very influential in bringing the workers on the west coast, in the maritime industry, into a frame of mind where they felt that they should do something to obtain better

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

conditions. That was discussed, and that their influence generally was there.

Q. A large influence?

A. The report said there was a large influence.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I want the record to show that we are not objecting to hearsay testimony.

Mr. Gladstein: What is that?

Presiding Inspector: He says he is not objecting to the hearsay testimony that you are introducing. Go ahead.

Mr. Gladstein: It would be unusual.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Honig, have you ever sought from an International [1552] officer of the American Newspaper Guild, of which you are a member, or any other person, a fraudulent recommendation in order to assist you to secure employment? A. No.

Q. Have you ever asked anyone to give you a recommendation in which it was to be stated that you had worked on the New York World?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever worked on the New York World?

A. Never worked on the New York World, in my life.

Q. Have you ever asked anyone to give you a reference, or recommendation, in which you requested the statement to be made that you had worked on the New York Globe?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, does counsel want to make an offer of evidence?

Presiding Inspector: I don't know. I think I will allow it. This is cross examination.

A. No, I never did.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you ever worked on the New York Globe?

A. No. The New York Globe went out of existence, I guess, while I was still going to school.

Q. Have you ever asked anyone to give you a recommendation, or reference, in which it was to be stated, at your request, that you had worked for a St. Louis paper by the name of [1553] the Globe-Democrat?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever worked for such a paper?

A. I never have been in St. Louis in my life.

Q. Well, then, you have never worked for such a paper?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever asked anyone to give you a reference, or recommendation in order to enable you to secure a job and in which, at your request, it was to be stated that you had worked for the San Francisco Bulletin?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever worked for the San Francisco Bulletin?

A. Never. You mean the Call-Bulletin. I assume.

Q. Did you ever ask Victor Pasche for a recommendation to enable you to get a job?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. I might possibly have written him a letter asking him to recommend me as to character, and so forth, yes; and as to my ability as a newspaper man.

Q. Who is Victor Pasche?

A. Victor Pasche is International Secretary-Treasurer—International Treasurer, I guess his title is, of the American Newspaper Guild.

The Reporter: How do you spell the name?

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know how to spell his name? [1554]

A. I think I do. I think it is P-a-s-c-h-e.

Mr. Gladstein: Would your Honor object to taking the morning recess now?

Presiding Inspector: No.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: Call back the witness.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Honig, how many trips have you taken to the Soviet Union? A. Just one.

Q. During the time that you were there, you were continuously there? That is, you didn't come back to the United States and then go back there again?

A. No; I never came back to the United States after I left, and then went back; no.

Q. Can you date the first time you ever met Harry Bridges? A. The exact date?

Q. Approximately?

A. The first time I saw Harry Bridges I guess

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

was at the Central Labor Council. He was there as a delegate. He was simply speaking on the floor as a delegate. The date, I imagine, was about the first week I came here.

Q. When was that?

A. In April 1935, I guess. [1555]

Q. What is the date of the first Sunday night meeting that you were talking about yesterday?

A. I don't remember the exact date.

Q. Well, the approximate date?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to the question. What meeting? Was it a Top Fraction meeting? The witness testified to several kinds of meetings.

Presiding Inspector: I think he is now referring to a meeting at the Labor Council.

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw the question.

Presiding Inspector: Aren't you?

Mr. Gladstein: No. I will withdraw the question.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You were talking yesterday about some top Fraction meetings that were held on Sunday nights.

A. Yes. I didn't say they were all on Sunday nights. I said generally they were held on Sunday nights.

Q. I want to direct your attention to those meetings. Give me the approximate date of the first of such meetings.

A. I am going to answer that to the best of my

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

recollection as to the approximate date that it occurred. The first such meeting that I attended, at which I saw Harry Bridges present, occurred perhaps about two weeks or three weeks prior to the opening of the 1936 strike here. It was in the preparatory stage of that, and the discussion at that meeting was [1556] about the preparation for that possible strike.

Q. Am I to infer that you attended these meetings yourself prior to this date, but you did not see Harry Bridges there?

A. No. I can't recall whether at the very first meeting I attended Bridges was there or not.

Q. You don't know that?

A. No, I don't know that definitely.

Q. What was discussed at that first meeting?

A. The entire meeting, as all subsequent meetings, was taken up with discussions of the work along the waterfront, Communist Party work along the waterfront, and in the Maritime Union. That was a topic of discussion too.

Q. What was said in that connection, anything that you can remember?

Presiding Inspector: You are asking about a particular meeting?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes; the first meeting.

Presiding Inspector: Do you think that advances us very much? Here were a series of meetings, according to the testimony. Are you trying to test his recollection? I am asking merely for information. Ordinarily a person in a series of

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

meetings won't remember what occurred at any particular meeting unless there was something distinct to call his attention to it. [1557]

Mr. Gladstein: I will put it in a general form.

Presiding Inspector: I think we would advance more.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. First, let me ask you this preliminary question: You don't know where any of these meetings were held, is that right? Or you can't state now?

A. No. I can't state for the reason that it was strict—a Party policy promptly to forget, promptly to forget the number. As far as I was concerned, that was my instructions.

Q. You don't know now where those meetings were held, is that correct?

Presiding Inspector: The houses, you mean?

A. No. The exact street addresses, I don't remember.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. All right. Now tell us, if you will, some of these specific topics that were discussed at any of these meetings.

A. Well, there was only one general specific topic: always work on the waterfront in the Maritime Unions and maritime industry. There were, what you might call, sub-topics stemming out of that one general specific topic. And I can tell you, if you want, if you mean that, I can tell you what some of them were.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Give me anything that you can remember about any of those meetings.

A. Q.K. For instance, not at one meeting but at [1558] many meetings the work of the Communist Party members in the Longshoremen's Union was discussed. The work, the topic, for instance, of how to go about recruiting new Communist Party members in the Longshoremen's Union would be a topic frequently. That would also be a topic in regard to several of the other unions that representatives, that is, members of those unions were present from at the meetings. That was a very frequent topic.

As I mentioned before, at the first meeting that I saw Harry Bridges *at of* those top fraction meetings, the preparation for the 1936 strike was one of the topics. I don't say that these were the first such top fraction meetings held. This was among the first that I attended and, for all I know, that topic may have been discussed before I started attending. But that was also a topic at subsequent meetings until the strike itself occurred.

Another topic that would be discussed was relationship with other unions, in the A. F. of L., for instance. A topic that would be discussed would be the various figures in the Central Labor Council, its officials, their attitude toward the strike, the waterfront unions, their attitude toward Harry Bridges, their political ideas, their ideas on running a trade union. That would be a frequent topic.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. All right. Now—excuse me.

A. Well, I could go on, I guess— [1559]

Q. Go ahead.

A. (Continuing): —and give you more, if you want them. In that connection the attitude on how to assail, how to criticize or how to attack any trade union officials, particularly in the A. F. of L., who didn't particularly agree with the Communist Party leadership in the trade unions; how to do that, how to do that most effectively was a topic frequently. Oh, there were numerous topics and those were some.

Q. Now, on the topic of the attitude of leading officials of the American Federation of Labor toward Harry Bridges, can you recall anything that was said in that connection?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment, if your Honor please! The witness testified regarding the attitude of the officials of other trade unions in the American Federation of Labor toward Communist Party policy.

Mr. Gladstein: I heard his testimony and one of the things that he said was that, he says, they discussed the attitude of American Federation of Labor officials toward Harry Bridges. I want to ask a question on that. I haven't forgotten the other things he said.

Presiding Inspector: I don't recall that particular point.

Mr. Gladstein: Will you take the answer?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I will take the answer.

The Witness: Can I have the question again?

[1550]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Certainly. Do you want to hear the previous answer you gave, Mr. Honig?

A. No, no, no.

Q. Isn't it correct that you mentioned that one of the things discussed was the attitude of certain American Federation of Labor officials toward Harry Bridges?

A. Yes, particularly the Central Labor Council officials here.

Q. Yes. I thought you did. All right. Now, what was said? Anything said by anybody in that connection, can you remember?

A. Well, I can't quote specific word for word verbatim phrases, but I can give you the gist of what would be said—of what was said on occasion when these topics were discussed. For instance, the attitude of Vandeleur. I believe his name is Edward F. Vandeleur, who was then, I think, Secretary or President, I guess, of the Central Labor Council. He may have been Secretary. I think he was President. Towards the Longshoremen's Union as a whole, towards the Communist Party, towards what were called "militant trade union policies". That was discussed and, of course, it was generally agreed that Vandeleur's attitude was what they called "reactionary".

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

And then there would be discussed on how to overcome any influence that he might exert on the membership of the American [1561] Federation of Labor in San Francisco and in the State as a whole in spreading forth his opinions about the waterfront unions, about trade union policies and tactics and so forth.

The same would be discussed about, I remember MacLaughlin, the Teamster's Union official. I forget his first name. And about O'Connell, who was, I think, Secretary of the Central Labor Council at that time. Then the attitude of George Kidwell, who was a delegate to the Central Labor Council from the Bakery Wagon Drivers at the time. And it was regarded that he was generally liberal minded, progressive minded; that sometimes he would tend to agree with one side and other times with another side—with the other side. And John Shelley, also then a delegate of the Bakery Wagon Drivers, and more or less the same attitude was taken towards him and discussions—the same opinion expressed there. I can't say that those are the definite words, but that was the gist.

Q. All right. What decisions, if any, were made in these meetings with respect to Vandeleur?

A. Oh, simply—I don't know whether you could call them actual "decisions"; just a matter of coming to an agreement on what attitude, in turn, would be adopted on him and his influence. You may call them "decisions" if you want to. It was some-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

thing commonly agreed on and accepted there, and as far as he was concerned, it was agreed that he should be called "reactionary", "phony" and what not and severely [1562] assailed, to the workers.

Q. You mean that the conclusion or decision as a result of the discussion on Vandeleur was that he was to be publicly assailed? A. Yes.

Q. Any other conclusion or decision?

A. I don't recall any other. That applies to O'Connell, I mentioned; MacLaughlin; more or less the same thing, the same type of decision was reached.

Q. Any other decision or conclusion arrived at with respect to O'Connell or MacLaughlin?

A. No; I just said that more or less the same decision was arrived at.

Q. What decision, if any, was arrived at with respect to Mr. Kidwell?

A. Oh, simply to try to—well, he was regarded as a liberal, who sometimes, well they would use the phrase about him that he would be "muddled"; sometimes in his efforts to be fair minded he would stroll over, he would give aid and comfort to the reactionaries maybe without meaning to do so. That would be discussed. And as far as any decision about him was concerned, I couldn't say definitely that you would call that a "decision" either. It is a matter of how to try to work with him, how to try to convince him that the side that the members there believed in was right.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Well then, is it correct that no conclusion or decision of any specific nature can be recalled by you with [1563] respect to Mr. Kidwell?

A. Not in regard to any kind of action; what you might call "definite action."

Q. To be taken?

A. To be taken about him. Perhaps it might be decided, well, to have Bridges or somebody else talk to the man and get his ideas and give, say, Bridges' ideas.

Q. Any decisions or conclusions that you can recall with respect to the attitude of Mr. Shelley?

A. Much the same as applied to Mr. Kidwell.

Q. And when do you date the making of these decisions with respect to Mr. Vandeleur, Mr. MacLaughlin and Mr. O'Connell?

A. I would say all through that 1936 and '37 strike. That was when they were particularly concerned with the actions and attitudes of these officials.

Q. This was a sort of running decision going throughout the meetings throughout this strike period?

A. I will tell you how they would come up. Somebody would say "Well, did you see what Vandeleur—the statement that Vandeleur made today in the Chronicle?" Or News, or whatever it was, the Examiner. And then they discussed that statement and how to answer that statement.

Q. When you talk about "statements" what kind of statements are you referring to?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Well, I couldn't say definitely whether it would [1564] be a statement officially made by Vandeleur in his position, that is, in his post, the office he held; or just maybe a personal statement by Vandeleur.

Q. Yes. But what would be the tenor of that statement?

A. Oh, quite often he would refer to what the Communist Party members regarded as progressive trade unions—he would refer to them as "Red", perhaps. I can't say that that was his definite words, but he would attack certain types of policy and action that the Communists regarded as progressive. He would regard it as reactionary in statements that he would issue, not merely in the strike, but generally all along that period that I was down here in regard to trade union work generally.

Q. Can you remember any particular statement that came up in these discussions that was made by Mr. Vandeleur attacking the waterfront unions or the strike conducted by them?

A. No, I can't.

Q. But there were some statements?

A. I am pretty sure there were. If they weren't statements, then it would be a question of attitude or something that he said on the floor of the Central Labor Council, which in itself is a statement too. This also I—I might have seemed to limit such discussions to that strike period, [1565] but in the period when the affiliation of the Longshoremen to the CIO took place, in that period and the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

period of the formulation of that policy, I think also at that time Vandeleur made attacks and these Teamster Officials issued statements attacking it both publicly and in the press, and I know definitely in the Labor Council. And then the same kind of discussion would go on with respect to how to answer that.

Q. When was that, Mr. Honig?

A. I can't tell you the exact date, that the change took place now.

Q. Give us your best recollection.

A. To my best judgment it might have been shortly after the strike ended in February, 1936. But that's just an attempt to remember the date. It is not myself trying to be authentic as to that time.

Q. Could it have happened during the latter part of the strike?

A. It either happened then or shortly after the strike was over, in my recollection.

Q. Well, that is your best recollection, is it?

A. Yes.

Q. Was Mr. Bridges present at these meetings where this question of CIO affiliation was discussed?

A. He was present at some of them, yes. [1566]

Q. And that would include meetings during the strike and shortly thereafter? A. Yes.

Q. Now, what was the discussion of CIO affiliation?

A. The consensus of opinion was that it was favorable towards such affiliation at that time. I

(Testimony of Nat Hönig.)

don't say that that was true through all meetings. Earlier there had been no agreement towards CIO affiliation and it was felt that it would be best to remain in the affiliation they had then. But when—I can say it this way: That discussions were held in the Trade Union Commission of the Communist Party for the California District regarding correspondence and instructions that had come from the Central Committee of the Party in New York on that question and following such discussions at the Communist Party trade union meetings then the thing was handed to this top fraction of the maritime industry for discussion.

Q. Is it your testimony, then, that the discussions in the top fraction meetings began as a result of instructions being sent from the Central Committee of the Communist Party on the question of CIO affiliation? A. Yes.

Q. What were those instructions?

A. I can't tell you the exact things.

Q. Well, the essence of them.

A. Well, the essence was that they had discussed this [1567] question in New York again at the National Trade Union Commission of the Communist Party, and they had discussed the various aspects of the question, and after long and frequent discussion had come to the conclusion that by this stage it would be better for the longshoremen on the West Coast to go into the CIO. That is, that it would be best for the Communists among the longshoremen to work for such a change-over.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Then, is it your testimony that in some of the meetings at the tail end of the strike and those which took place shortly after the end of the strike instructions were received by the top fraction to the effect that the members of the top fraction were to exert themselves to achieve the change of affiliation as soon as possible of the longshoremen to the CIO?

A. Well now, I am ~~not~~ trying to place the dates as specifically as you have made it there. I did say, as far as my recollection goes, I think it was in that period possibly towards the very end of the strike, towards the tail end of the strike, and in my opinion probably after the strike, and not so long after the strike. But I can't be more specific than that..

Q. According to your best recollection and judgment, the statement that was contained in my question would be a correct one; is that right?

A. Yes. I will tell you what I could—I could date it better this way: Well, let's see! No, I couldn't. I don't think I could be more specific on it than I am trying to. [1568] It may have been some months after the strike at that, but—(Pause).

Q. Well, you left San Francisco not very long after the strike ended, didn't you?

A. Yes. I left San Francisco in September—in June or maybe the first week of July. I forget exactly when.

Q. In 1937?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. By that time the affiliation—that change-over had occurred and had been in existence for a number of months anyway.

Q. So, therefore, these top fraction meeting discussions of the question of CIO affiliation would have happened, according to your best judgment, in and during the strike and immediately thereafter?

A. Yes. That's according to my best recollection. I would like to—

Q. (Interposing): I haven't asked you a question.

A. No. I am talking on the last question.

Q. You mean you haven't finished your last answer?

A. I am just adding something to my answer, if I may.

Q. Go ahead.

A. I would like to again stress that I can't recall that period specifically. That might have been even early in the strike or just prior to the strike sometime.

Presiding Inspector: You are not sure about the exact period? [1569]

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: I think you have made that clear.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When you added that, did you mean to indicate that because of this difficulty you have in re

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

membering that it is possible that the question of instructions from New York for the Communists in the top fraction in San Francisco to exert efforts to bring the longshoremen into the CIO could have been discussed during the early stage of the 1936-37 strike and even a little bit before that strike began? Is that what you meant?

A. Yes, I think so. And I will tell you, it is this: This question of the CIO in all unions on the waterfront, as far as discussion in the Communist Party fractions were concerned, had come up from the very time of the actual formation of the CIO, which was at the end of 1935. So that that subject as a possibility came up at all Communist Party meetings in respect to trade unions long before the actual start of that strike. So as a topic of possible affiliation with the CIO, I would say that that might have been started long before the beginning of the strike even, as a possibility.

Q. All right. Now, so those instructions—I want to talk about those for a minute. Is there any question in your mind that those instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party were that the longshoremen on the Pacific Coast [1570] were to go CIO? There is no doubt in your mind about that, is there?

A. The final instructions, yes, before the longshoremen actually did.

Q. And I think you said that those instructions were mandatory on Bridges?

A. As a Communist Party member.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Were they mandatory on Bridges?

A. As a Communist Party member all instructions from any leading body of the Communist Party were mandatory on him.

Q. All right.

A. I would also like to elaborate a word or so on that, too, on the answer that I just gave you, if it is all right. And that is this: That once a decision was arrived at by the Communist Party it was mandatory that it be accepted. There could be discussion as to the merits of that decision, but once a decision was adopted that was mandatory, absolutely.

Presiding Inspector: I think you have already said that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. That is, a Communist Party member would have to follow that decision out?

A. Yes, when that was adopted as a decision.

Q. Now, throughout these various meetings—let us take them in a group now, because you undoubtedly would have difficulty, I suppose, trying to think of them in terms [1571] of separate meetings. Can you recall any particular subject that Mr. Bridges discussed during any of those meetings?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I think that has already been asked and answered. He gave a list of the things that had been discussed.

Presiding Inspector: If he can remember anything else. I think that is so.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Gladstein: I didn't ask him anything about what Mr. Bridges is supposed to have discussed.

Presiding Inspector: No, no. I understand that. You want him to give anything else that he can remember that—

Mr. Gladstein (Interposing): No, that isn't it.

Presiding Inspector: Just read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Presiding Inspector: You want to know anything else that Mr. Bridges discussed.

Mr. Gladstein: I haven't asked him heretofore.

The Witness: Yes, I can.

Mr. Gladstein: I asked him before about topics that were discussed.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I suppose they all consist—

Mr. Gladstein (Interposing): Now I am asking him for anything that he says that Mr. Bridges discussed.

Presiding Inspector: Including all you have been over?

Mr. Gladstein: I am asking him now any subject. [1572]

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't understand. I asked you a simple question. Including what has already been gone over?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know whether the witness will include it or exclude it. I want to know what he claims Mr. Bridges said.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't require him to include it or exclude it. I am asking you whether you mean to go over, if Mr. Bridges took part in them, what you have just been over.

Mr. Gladstein: If he claims Mr. Bridges made statements regarding anything he talked about, I want to know those statements.

Presiding Inspector: Now, you want to hear in general anything that Mr. Bridges discussed or took part in the discussion, I suppose:

Mr. Gladstein: Whatever he said that this witness—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): In substance?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

A. Well, the topics that I have mentioned that were taken up at these meetings, I should think pretty nearly every one of them Mr. Bridges had something to say on them at one time or another.

And here again I can't tell exact words. [1573]

But if it were the topic, for instance, on how—what attitude to take towards—how to answer Vandeleur on a certain statement, he would participate, and, of course, he concurred with the rest of those present, that a certain statement was in his mind reactionary and that it should be shown to the workers to be reactionary. That would be in substance what he would say about it, not his exact words. I did mention before—

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. (Interposing): May I interrupt for just a moment? A. Yes.

Q. What you have just said, you can't actually remember any such thing? You are simply giving a conclusion on it, aren't you?

A. No, no. I mean to say that Bridges would take part in a discussion on some statement made by Vandeleur and Bridges would say—Bridges said not in these exact words, but the gist of it was that he concurred in what the others said there that Vandeleur's particular statement was in his mind reactionary and that it should be answered and that it should be shown to the workers as being reactionary.

Now, that's on one particular subject that I can remember he spoke about.

Q. Well, then, your testimony in regard to the Vandeleur question is that you remember nothing that Mr. Bridges contributed that stands out in your mind except that, you say, he concurred in discussion that took place on that subject? [1574]

A. And he agreed and he urged that an answer should be given.

Q. Was any disagreement expressed by Mr. Bridges on that question or any other that you can remember?

A. I don't recall any. He may—at meetings when Vandeleur was discussed he may have disagreed on just the exact wording, maybe, of a statement that was to be issued and answered of

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Vandeleur, but not on the idea that an answer should be issued to it.

Q. Can you recall any subject at all on which Mr. Bridges disagreed?

A. Yes. I can recall one subject that there was disagreement about definitely, and that was the question of, for instance, Lundeberg. I mentioned before here that Mr. Bridges was very bitter about Lundeberg and would in quite a huff state that he believed Lundeberg ought to be "dumped", and there were others here that didn't think that that would be a good thing to do, it would just create a series of "dumpings" and "counter-dumpings", and so forth, and they tried to point that out to Bridges. There was disagreement on that.

Q. Was a decision made on that?

A. No. There was no decision made to do any such thing.

Q. To do any what thing?

A. There was no decision ever made to do any "dumping". [1575]

Q. What was the decision made on the question?

A. Oh, the thing was just dropped, that's all.

Q. There was no decision made? A. No.

Q. The thing was just dropped? A. Yes.

Q. Any other subject on which you say Mr. Bridges disagreed?

A. I should say on almost any topic that came up, you might not call it "disagreement", he would just have a suggestion on the method as to how to

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

do a particular thing and another one would have another suggestion, and the idea would be to make those suggestions jibe.

Q. Can you think of anything particular or specific?

A. Not specific, no; on almost any of the topics I have mentioned.

Q. All right. Now, can you think of any other topic that Mr. Bridges expressed himself on?

A. Oh, yes. I think he would express himself occasionally on a strike that perhaps some other union was having. The union had called, maybe, on the longshoremen, to give them financial assistance or something like that. It was one of these day-to-day problems; I mean, not one of these basic problems, but one of these things that would come up. And he would talk on to what extent he might think they ought to help that union, and he would say he thought they should help [1576] the union.

Q. Do you remember anything specific in that connection?

A. No. I do believe, though I won't say specifically, there were questions of agricultural strikes in other parts of the State that would occur from time to time and assistance—maybe financially—would be discussed to them.

Q. Well, do you remember anything that Bridges said?

A. Bridges would generally say that he thought that they ought to be helped by the longshoremen to the best of the longshoremen's ability.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Was that in agreement or disagreement with other opinions expressed?

A. No. I don't remember ever having been disagreement on a topic like that.

Q. So you remember nothing specific that Mr. Bridges said on that question of 'agricultural strikes'?

A. No, not specific words; just except his opinion that they ought to be assisted.

Q. Now, you mentioned the Lundeberg issue. That stands out in your mind, does it?

A. That stands out.

Q. Is that the only thing that stands out in your mind where Mr. Bridges disagreed with the others at the meeting?

A. Yes, because that was about the only real case that [1577] I can remember where it was a question of a matter that would affect basic party strategy and, naturally, there was a great deal of calming down of Mr. Bridges by some of the others and (there was a great effort to calm him down and tell him that "that is not the kind of thing that we can afford to do").

Q. On all other subjects—fundamental subjects—would you say that Bridges was substantially in agreement with all of the others present, outside of the little minor, tentative or temporary disagreements which were ironed out?

A. At all meetings that I attended substantially so, yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. That is, substantial agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. And the only fundamental thing on which you can recall any disagreement was the question of Lundeborg?

A. Yes.

Q. And then Bridges was completely in accord with the others on the question of CIO affiliation; I take it?

A. Yes, substantially so.

Q. What decision or decisions were made during these meetings on the question of CIO affiliation?

A. The way it would be was this way: A representative of, say, the District Committee of the Party—maybe Schneidermann himself, District Secretary, perhaps—

Q. (Interposing) Could I interrupt just one second?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute! [1578]

Mr. Gladstein: I will give him an opportunity to answer that question.

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I realize that my question assumed something and I wanted to ask you; first of all, whether during these meetings that you are talking about any actual decision or conclusion was arrived at with respect to CIO affiliation on the part of the longshoremen?

A. I will put it this way: —

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Just a minute!

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I suggest he answer—he was starting to answer the first question and he hasn't completed it yet. Now, Counsel has another question. I believe the witness should answer the first one.

Mr. Gladstein: It may be that the witness will say that there were no such conclusions or decisions. I don't know.

Presiding Inspector: Well, it is technical. I think I will let Mr. Gladstein go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you remember the last question?

A. Yes, I remember. I will answer that by saying that, rather than on basic policies such as the CIO affiliation question, rather than decisions being made there, it would be a question of ratification of proposals brought in. [1579]

Q. Well, in other words, would this be correct? That the top fraction meetings got instructions from the Central Committee in New York City that the longshoremen on the West Coast should go CIO; that this question or these instructions were discussed in the top fraction meetings and that the instructions were concurred in or endorsed or ratified?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute, please! I object to that, if your Honor please. That isn't what the witness testified to.

Mr. Gladstein: I am asking him now.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, the witness testified just previously that these instructions were received

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

at these fraction meetings and all that was discussed there was the method and means of carrying them out.

Presiding Inspector: I think the witness can take care of himself.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Were you about to answer "Yes"?

A. I will have to have it repeated.

Q. Don't you remember whether you were about to answer "Yes"?

A. I don't recall that.

Q. Whether you were about to answer "Yes"?

A. I don't know.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think that that is a proper [1580] question. I know you don't think so, either.

Mr. Gladstein: Read the question, please.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

The Witness: Substantially my answer would be "Yes", that they ratified that decision.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. On the question of CIO affiliation and before the ratification by the top fraction meetings, do you recall any statements or expression of position by Mr. Bridges?

A. On that topic?

Q. Yes.

A. Not in so many words. All I can recall after that lapse of time was the general opinion he held on the subject as expressed by him. In words, what words he put it, I can't recall. And the rea-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

son for that is that my object in being at the top fraction meetings was simply to gather background material for immediate—in order to enable me better to write up trade union news stories for a paper that came out twice a week and only for that immediate purpose.

Q. Well now, you say you can't remember any words Mr. Bridges used, but you say you do remember a general opinion. What was Mr. Bridges' opinion as expressed in these meetings on this question of CIO affiliation?

A. To the best of my recollection, just prior to the [1581] time that the affiliation actually occurred, Mr. Bridges agreed that it should be done.

Q. Well, do you recall any disagreement during any of those meetings? A. On that subject?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't recall any important disagreement on whether it should or should not be done, no.

Q. All right. Do you remember whether Mr. Bridges urged that the change to CIO take place?

A. I couldn't say that. I can't remember that he definitely urged it.

Q. Do you recall whether he made any reports of any kind mentioning the name of John L. Lewis?

A. He has mentioned John L. Lewis many times. Everybody in those days mentioned John L. Lewis in one way or another, yes. And I know he did.

Q. Well, what did he say about John L. Lewis during these top fraction meetings?

A. Well, I do remember, I think—I can't say

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

this in definite words—to the best of my recollection at earlier meetings of those top fraction meetings when Lewis was mentioned, he did refer to Lewis, Lewis' past record at times, and he said there were spots in Lewis' record that weren't too good as far as his attitude towards what was called, "militant trade unionism" was concerned, and that he hoped that Lewis had [1582] changed now in his attitude towards "militant trade unionism". He did mention such words about Lewis himself. He wasn't talking about the CIO. Just talking about Lewis as a person.

Q. Substantially he would be pro-Lewis, is that right, with reservations?

A. I think he would be pro-Lewis in so far as Lewis gave as his aims now in the trade union movement.

Q. As of that time, you mean?

A. Yes. That is, the aims of industrial unionism.

Q. And Bridges would be pro-Lewis as of that time—

A. (Interposing) Yes.

Q. (Continuing) —in—wait a minute! Wait a minute!

A. Oh, I am sorry.

Q. (Continuing) —with respect to Bridges urging affiliation with the CIO, is that right?

A. I didn't say that he himself did the urging. I just told you, as I recall it, his opinion on whether that should be done or not. He didn't—

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. (Interposing) Well, he was in favor of it?

A. Yes. He concurred in the idea of it.

Presiding Inspector: Did the discussion include when it should be done or how it should be done?

The Witness: Well, as to how, of course, there was only one way it could be done: Just make application for a CIO charter to the International—to the central headquarters of the CIO back East.

[1583]

Presiding Inspector: Would there have to be a vote taken to do that?

The Witness: There would have to be later a vote of the membership of the particular union, of the Longshoremen's Union.

Presiding Inspector: That is what I mean.

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Was that discussed?

The Witness: That was at times discussed later, yes.

Presiding Inspector: And when it should be done?

The Witness: Yes. I believe, yes, to my recollection, when it should be done.

Presiding Inspector: If you don't remember these things, just say so.

The Witness: To the best of my recollection, the question of when the question of endorsement by the longshoremen did come up.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you recall when it came up?

A. Do you mean at what meeting?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. At what approximate meeting. I am not asking you what specific meeting.

A. Oh, after there had been thorough agreement at the top fraction among the members there on the fact that—I mean, thorough understanding on the necessity and the basic reasons why this was, being advocated by the Central Committee and the [1584] Trade Union Commission of the Party, after that had been thoroughly gone into and understood, then the next question that came up was how to get the majority of the longshoremen to favor such affiliation. And to my recollection it was thought—it was stated there that the sentiment of the longshoremen was for such affiliation anyway; that is, in San Francisco.

Presiding Inspector: I may not understand this, but the officers could make the application first and get ratification later? Is that the idea?

The Witness: I can't answer that absolutely correctly in a technical sense. I don't know whether the executive—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Then, don't try to.

The Witness: Yes, O.K. [1585]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You recall no decision which set a date of any kind?

A. I think—I don't mean I think—to the best of my recollection such a date for a vote on the question, or it might have been for it to come up at the next convention—I don't recall that exactly

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

—such a date was discussed, such a time for such a ratification, but what that particular date or time was I can't recall.

Q. But you remember that during one or more of these Top Fraction meetings there was an agreement reached upon the setting of a date when the longshoremen were to either apply for a charter or attempt to go into the CIO?

A. To both apply for a charter and enter into the CIO; yes. . .

Q. Is that right? A. Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: Your Honor, I would like to turn the examination over at this point to Mr. Grossman, if that is permissible. I have not prepared on several topics and he has. I recognize this is within the discretion of the Court, but I ask your discretion in the matter.

Presiding Inspector: You are not going over the same matters?

Mr. Gladstein: No; not the same matters.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. I see no objection. [1586]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. When did you for the first time discuss with any representative of the FBI the possibility of your testifying in this case?

A. Last November, I am pretty sure, of 1940, I was called up at my home, and I believe it was by Mr. Dickstein—D-i-c-k-s-t-e-i-n—I believe that is the spelling, and he asked me if I would come up

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

to his office and see him about something. I said I didn't think so. I said, "I am busy."

He wanted to know if I could come up that day and I said I didn't think so; that I would be working all day.

Then he said, "Can you come up the next day?"

I said "No."

I was trying to dodge the idea of going up to the office. I was trying to put him off.

Well, I think he called—it was on a Wednesday or Thursday—and I said I couldn't go that day. And the following day; which I think was Friday, he said "How about Saturday?" Friday he called up and said "How about tomorrow? Can you come up and talk to us?"

I said, "Yes, I will come up and see what you want."

I went up to his office. I think it was in the Vance Building in Seattle. I am not sure of that, but I think it was.

He said that they had been told—he didn't tell me by whom—that I had been a member of the Communist Party [1587] for quite a while, but that now, particularly in the Newspaper Guild, I had been opposing Communist Party policies as applied to the Newspaper Guild itself, and he had heard all these things; and he also had heard that I knew whether Bridges was a Communist Party member or not. He asked me to tell him were these facts true.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I said, "It is true that I have been a member of the Communist Party, and it is true that in the Newspaper Guild I had been on the side opposed to the Communist Party, as far as the Newspaper Guild itself was concerned, and work in the Guild."

"As for the third question," I said, "I have heard people say that Bridges is a Communist Party member, and I have heard people say he isn't. I am not going to say whether I know he is or not."

I don't recall whether I definitely said—I think I simply ignored the question.

Well, I was asked repeatedly, couldn't I in some way tell them just person to person whether I knew, as one person talking to another—this was in the FBI office—whether I knew whether I had attended Communist Party meetings with Bridges or not.

I said, "I am not prepared to talk on the subject with you."

"Well," they said, "won't you think it over?"

[1588]

I said, "I will think it over."

I went home. Then—

Q. (Interposing) Just a moment.

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interrupting) Just a moment. The witness is answering the question.

Mr. Grossman: I don't want him to go through five or six meetings. I want to confine it to a particular meeting.

Presiding Inspector: Let's go back and find out

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

what the question was. I have forgotten it, it was so long ago.

(The question was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't call for any discussion as to what was said at all.

The Witness: He asked for the time. Well, the answer is that it was in November of last year.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Who was present at the FBI office outside of Mr. Dickstein?

A. There were a lot of people in the suite of offices, but in the particular office that I was in there was Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala.

Q. During the entire questioning, or conversation between you and Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala, was there anyone else present?

A. Only people passing through the room on their way in and out. [1589]

Presiding Inspector: He means taking part in the conversation or discussion.

The Witness: Only the three of us, as far as I know.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Was there any stenographer present?

A. No; there was no stenographer present in my conversations with them.

Q. Did anyone among you three take notes as to what transpired?

A. No. I didn't, and I didn't see them take any.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. When Mr. Dickstein spoke to you on the telephone did he tell what he wanted to speak to you about?

A. No, he didn't mention specifically what. He just said he wanted me to come up and see him.

Q. Did he tell you enough to indicate they knew what he wanted to see you about?

A. No, he didn't.

Q. Did you know what he wanted to speak to you about?

A. No, I didn't.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, the witness has answered that two or three times; that he didn't know, that the agent didn't tell him.

Mr. Grossman: I think it will appear that those were different questions.

Presiding Inspector: He has answered. Go ahead. [1590]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you please tell us why you didn't want to go up to the FBI offices as Mr. Dickstein suggested?

A. Well, for one reason, it was this: That I had been active in the Newspaper Guild in Seattle, and in other cities, and I didn't know what the membership of the Newspaper Guild thought about the FBI as an organization. I knew what lots of them thought about various other types of agencies, but I didn't know what they thought about this one; that is, the majority of the people who were my friends in the Guild and with whom I worked. I

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

didn't want to take any steps without knowing what they felt about this organization as a whole, the FBI.

Q. Was it your state of mind at the time that you were telephoned by Mr. Dickstein, that you thought he wanted to talk to you about some crime you had committed?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that. His state of mind at the time has nothing to do with the issues here. It isn't proper cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: I think that the last sentence contains an implication.

Mr. Grossman: There is no implication there.

Presiding Inspector: Let us hear the question. You listen closely to the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.) [1591]

Presiding Inspector: I reject that on the ground that it implies, assumes that he committed a crime.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Was your state of mind, at the time you were telephoned by Mr. Dickstein, that you thought he wanted to discuss with you the commission of a crime by anyone?

A. I didn't have the slightest idea what he wanted to discuss with me; so my state of mind was one of puzzlement.

Q. At the time Mr. Dickstein called was your state of mind that you thought Mr. Dickstein believed you had committed a crime?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, the witness has just answered that he had none; that it was one of puzzlement.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow you to press it.

A. No. I didn't think, I didn't know what he wanted to see me about; no.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Is it correct that the sole basis for your unwillingness to comply with Mr. Dickstein's request was the attitude that you thought other members of the Newspaper Guild might have if you went up to talk to the FBI?

A. No. I didn't say that was the sole basis, and that wasn't. There were other things perhaps equally important.

Q. Will you state the others, please?

A. Yes, as I recall them. One was that I still had a [1592] carry-over from the days when I was in the Party as hostile to dealing with any Government agencies. That is the thing that we had been taught to believe a Communist Party member should not do, or that any worker or any union member should not do. I still had somewhat of that in my system, that is, a hang-over from that. Therefore, I didn't feel like going either for that reason.

Then, again, I felt that Mr. Dickstein was so vague. I perhaps could understand why he couldn't tell me on the telephone specifically what he wanted me for, but I felt that there was enough vagueness

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

for me not to want to go to see anybody or something that I had no idea about. This, of course, was not a basic reason.

I think the two first ones were the main reasons.

Q. Can you explain why you changed your mind some time in that week when he first called you, between that time and Friday when he called you again, with reference to going down to the FBI office?

A. Why I changed my mind about seeing him?

Q. Yes.

A. I talked it over with my wife, and with Guild members. They all said, "What harm will it do to see what he wants to ask you, or what he wants to take up with you?"

I said, "Well, I still don't like the idea." But everybody I had spoken to had this opinion: That I might as [1593] well go and see him. So I went.

Q. When you discussed it with other people did you discuss the possibility that he wanted you to give him some information on the Bridges case or on Bridges?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Then when you discussed it with other people, and when you finally made a decision to go down to the FBI office, you still had no better idea than you had at first as to what the subject matter of this discussion was going to be at the FBI office?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. How did this meeting end on Saturday? Was there some understanding as to future meetings?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. To the best of my recollection, the meeting ended on a note that I still—of course, I had been made acquainted with Mr. Dickstein's intentions. After learning those the meeting ended with my telling him that I could not comply with what he was requesting in any form whatsoever. That was the way I felt. I gave him reasons why I felt so.

I said, "As far as I am concerned that is my definite and final opinion on the matter, my definite and final feeling on it."

As far as I felt then it was my final feeling at that time.

He said, "Well, you still can think that over, and I wish [1594] you would. I will get in touch with you next week."

I said, "It will not be necessary for you to do that, but you can do it if you want to. You can call me up again."

That is the way that meeting ended.

Q. What did you tell Mr. Dickstein that you felt on that question?

A. I told Mr. Dickstein that I felt that, in the first place, there was a group of us, and a substantial group, in the American Newspaper Guild who were conducting a fight against certain people in the Newspaper Guild who were Communist Party members; a fight simply to remove a certain influence and hold that they had been having over this local of the Newspaper Guild; that I felt, for one thing, that to get involved in an other question that involved Communism in any way would distract

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

from my activity and my taking part with my fellow-Newspaper Guild members in that fight against the Communist Party people in the Guild; and for that reason, as one reason, I didn't want to do that; that I didn't want to take part in any way in what he had requested me to do.

Another reason was that I said—also taking into account the feeling of my friends in the Newspaper Guild, I didn't know definitely what they thought of the FBI as an organization in relationship to labor; and that for all I knew they all would think, if I dealt with the FBI in any way, for that matter, even as far as going up to the office, as far I knew, if I dealt [1595] with the FBI in any way, maybe even those very people who were with me, and whom I was working with against the Communist Party control in the Newspaper Guild, maybe even those people will think that this would be an anti-labor thing to do. I wanted to find that out definitely, if the majority of those people involved with me in that struggle, you might call it, in the Newspaper Guild in Seattle, did not think it was anti-labor. I still hadn't found that out.

That was another reason.

These were the main reasons.

One more reason was this: I felt, as a newspaper man, that a newspaper man isn't it—it isn't a rule on any paper, it isn't a fixed rule, but more or less of a kind of a tradition, that a newspaper man should try not to be in the news; his job is

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

to cover news and not to be in the news. I felt that to do what he asked me to do at that time would probably involve me as a subject to be mentioned in news dispatches and news stories.

That wasn't a very major reason, but it had sort of an influence on me.

Those are about the only reasons I think I gave as far as I remember.

Q. Did Mr. Dickstein tell you he wanted you to be a witness in the Bridges case?

A. Not at first. [1596]

Q. I mean in this Saturday meeting?

A. Yes; this is the Saturday meeting I am talking about. In fact, not at all at that Saturday meeting, as I recall it. He said—

Presiding Inspector: That answers the question.

A. No.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you explain why, if he didn't discuss you being a witness at the Bridges hearing, you raised the question of a reporter becoming part of the news?

A. Because I felt that to do so, what he did raise, what he did ask, would inevitably result in me becoming a witness in the case.

Q. I am concerned with your state of mind at the time. How did you feel that giving him any information would necessarily involve you in publicity?

A. Because the action he wanted me to take,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

rather, the request he made, for me to fulfill that, I felt, judging as a newspaper man, I would be bound to become involved in this particular case and it would lead to my becoming a witness in the case.

Q. Did you tell Mr. Dickstein that you had any information concerning whether Bridges was a Communist?

A. No. I definitely avoided that at that meeting, and at all meetings with him, avoided letting him know whether I [1597] had any information as to my positive definite knowledge on Bridges' political affiliation or belief.

Q. You mean you succeeded, in this whole meeting, in avoiding answering the question as to whether you had any information concerning Bridges being a Communist?

A. Yes; with great difficulty.

Q. But you did succeed?

A. I did succeed.

Q. Did you succeed because Mr. Dickstein discontinued pressing the point, or because he was more concerned with other points?

A. I believe, as far as my recollection is concerned, that I succeeded because I kept making it understood to him that I had definitely made up my mind at this time, anyway, about the matter, about his request, and there wouldn't be any point in pressing me further on it. I can't tell how he figured it, but then he stopped pressing me on it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Did he suggest any other ways in which you could cooperate with him, or help him, except by giving him the information he wanted on Bridges? A. Yes, he did.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: He has answered it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Does he mean matters involving this case, or some other matter? [1598]

Presiding Inspector: He answered it.

A. He did; about the Bridges case.

For one thing, he suggested that I tell him definitely, face to face, as one person talking to another, whether I knew Bridges as a Communist Party member. That was the first thing he did ask for. So I definitely said—

Presiding Inspector: The question is did he suggest any other way that you could assist him?

The Witness: Yes. That was one way, by telling him whether I knew, face to face—

Presiding Inspector: We have had that.

Any other?

The Witness: Yes. When I didn't prove willing to do that, he asked, I believe he did this, to the best of my recollection at that meeting, he asked would I be willing to sign an affidavit regarding anything I knew about Harry Bridges.

I told him, "No. If I refused your other request—this being a more important request—naturally I refuse this." And I did reject that request.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did he make any other requests?

A. I don't believe he did, except that I should think it over some more.

Q. Did you have another meeting with any representatives of the FBI? [1599]

A. I had another meeting with both Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala.

Q. How did this next meeting come about?

A. Well, it was Mr. Dickstein again who called me up at my home and asked me again to come up to the office and see him. I adopted the same practice of trying to dodge him, putting him off, telling him I was busy.

Finally, toward the end of the following week, I guess it was Thursday or Friday, after that Saturday meeting, again I said, "All right, I will go up this time and talk it over with you again, although I haven't changed my mind about the question."

I did go up.

Q. What happened at the second meeting—and it involved those two other men and yourself?

A. Yes.

Q. No one else?

A. No. I will say this: I was introduced—people would pass by with their work—and I was introduced, "Mr. so and so, meet Mr. Honig," and "Mr. so and so, meet Mr. Honig." That is all the conversation in that respect.

Q. No one else participated in the discussion?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. No; not at that meeting.

Q. And this next meeting was at the FBI offices, was it? A. That was at the FBI offices.

Q. What transpired at the second meeting?

[1600]

A. Substantially the same thing as at the Saturday meeting. Again I was asked if I would first say, man to man, did I know anything about Bridges, his political connections, and so forth. I rejected that request.

Then the same thing about the affidavit.

In addition, Mr. Dickstein, or Mr. Madala, or both, said, "Well, you know that you could be subpoenaed when a hearing occurs. We don't know definitely when it is going to be, but when it does occur you could be subpoenaed."

I said, "Well, I guess I could be, and if I were I would have to answer it," and I would. I said, "However, if I were you I would recognize the fact that I am not very willing to take part in this at all, and I request if you ever do want to subpoena me you please speak to me first and find out what frame of mind I have about the question."

That was more or less the substance of the conversation at the time.

Q. Did you again in the second meeting refuse to make any statement, oral or in writing, with respect to what you knew about Bridges being a Communist? A. Yes.

Presiding Inspector: You mean, when you said the second meeting, this was the third meeting?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Grossman: This was the second meeting.

The Witness: This is the second meeting. [1601]

Mr. Grossman: He was telephoned once.

A. I did refuse again.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Either in the first or second meeting, did either of these gentlemen make any arguments to you as to why you should comply with their requests?

A. Yes. They gave me the argument, they said, "Well, as a loyal American you should do it,"—arguments along that line; that I should cooperate with the Government in a request that they—they said, at least as a loyal American I should recognize—I am trying to get the exact words—I think they were these: At least as a loyal American I should recognize that I ought to not be unwilling to come up to the office of a division of my government, of the American government, and I ought not have an attitude of thinking they were, well something I might catch something from them—or words to that effect.

I said, "Well, I don't have that attitude. I come up now when you ask me to. But the other attitude I retain on the other subject."

Q. At either of those two meetings did he make any other argument, except those you have just stated, or did either of the men make any argument, except those stated?

A. I guess the only thing you could call an

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

argument was that they said that they had learned I probably had been in a [1602] position to have known Bridges, and if I had, and if I continued to feel that way, they would probably subpoena me, and, therefore, I would have to tell it anyway, and so if I knew anything about Bridges why shouldn't I tell them.

That is about the sum and substance of it.

Q. Did you intend, during either the first meeting or the second, to give these FBI men the impression that you knew something concerning Bridges' Communist affiliations?

A. No. I intended, as far as I could, to give the impression that I knew nothing about it.

A. At either of these two meetings were you asked any questions about specific meetings, or places, which involved Bridges?

A. To the best of my memory all I said—

Presiding Inspector: No. Answer the question "Yes" or "No".

The Witness: I would like to hear the question again.

Presiding Inspector: Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. No; not about specific meetings.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a recess until 2:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 P.M., a recess was taken until 2:00 P.M. of the same day.) [1603]

After Recess

2:00 O'Clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

NAT HONIG

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Honig, on what note did the second meeting with the representatives of the FBI end?

A. The second meeting was in last November, and ended on this note: That I still was firm in my rejection of any request that I would in any way take part in the Bridges case.

Q. Did it end on the same note as the first meeting? A. Yes.

Q. Did either of the FBI men state that he wanted to get in touch with you in the future?

A. In respect to that the situation then was, after I left that second meeting—

Q. (Interposing). Before you left the second meeting.

A. Or before, I mean at the culmination of that second meeting, where it stood in respect to this angle was this: That they said that they expected there would be a hearing, oh, some time in March or April, and they said "Next Spring," I think

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

that is what they said, and that they might subpoena me [1604] for that.

"Well," I said, "If you do intend to do that then I wish you would speak to me first and maybe I can convince you that you ought not do it, feeling the way I do about my wanting to take any part whatsoever in it."

They said, "Well, as that time draws near we will probably get in touch with you."

I said, "That is all right. You can get in touch with me any time you want to."

That is the way it ended up.

Q. At the first meeting did either of these FBI men talk about a hearing in this case?

A. At the first meeting in November?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. They mentioned that it was going to be—that is, they hoped to have a hearing, or they were working towards that purpose.

Q. Was their expression concerning the meeting any different than the second—concerning the hearing any different in the second meeting than the first?

A. To the best of my memory, fundamentally there wasn't. They also expressed it in the sense that they were working towards that aim of having the hearing some time in the spring.

Q. When was the next time that you had any communication with the FBI after the second meeting? [1605]

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Oh, after that second meeting, oh, about ten days ago, or maybe—

Q. (Interposing) What happened ten days ago?

A. Well, again, ten or eleven days ago—I don't remember exactly—I think it was on a Thursday—I was again called up at my home by Mr. Dickstein and he said he wanted to see me again. Of course, this time I knew what it was about because then it had been divulged from last year in November. And "Well," I said, "I guess I could do it." He wanted to know if I could see him the next day, which was Friday, and I said, "No, I would be working that day" and I didn't think I would be working Saturday, so I would come down Saturday morning if it was all right with him. So we arranged to come down to the FBI office, which was now in the new Government Building in Seattle.

Q. This was after the hearing had started?

A. I don't remember exactly just when the hearing started. It wasn't any more than ten or eleven days ago, and if the hearing was on then it was after.

Q. Are you sure it wasn't more than two weeks ago? A. I am pretty sure it wasn't.

Q. With reference to the time when you had this trouble with the department store, was it before or after that time? A. It was after that time.

Q. How long after? [1606]

A. I think, oh, about a week approximately.

Q. All right. You went down to the office of the FBI? A. I went down there, yes.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. On a Saturday?

A. On a Saturday morning.

Q. And what happened?

A. They asked me——

Q. (Interposing) Who is "they"?

A. Well, Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala. They were there and they conducted me into one of the offices in that suite of offices there, and they asked me had I changed my mind or changed my attitude towards testifying in the Bridges case. And I thought it over in all this time. That was about the first thing they asked me, and I——

Q. (Interposing) And you replied what, if you replied?

A. I replied, Yes, that I had changed my mind.

Q. Then what happened?

A. Well then, they proceeded to ask me would I be willing to sign a statement regarding what I knew about Bridges, what I knew about the Communist Party itself, and the Trade Union Unity League, and so forth. And I said that I would.

Q. Who was present when you had this conversation?

A. First just Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala, and then later—I don't know just how much later—a stenographer.

Q. How long did the conversation last? [1607]

A. Well, I got there at eleven. I guess I left there about 1:30 or a quarter to two.

Q. Did you give a statement in front of the stenographer?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

A. Yes. To the best of my memory, I did. I started to—wait! At this first time, no. I think that at this meeting I simply told them facts and they took notes on it, asked questions and then they took notes on it.

Q. Was the stenographer there when you gave them this information?

A. I believe at some time in the course of that there was; even at that first meeting there was. I am not certain of it, though, but I believe there was.

Q. Are you certain that the stenographer was there at some time during the conference?

A. During that first meeting?

Q. Saturday, when you first told them you were willing to testify?

A. I feel that there was, but I am not absolutely sure, at that meeting.

Presiding Inspector: By the "first meeting" you are referring to this recent one, this year?

The Witness: The first one this year; yes.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you give them in substance on that Saturday, all the information you have testified to here? [1608]

A. No, I didn't. I don't believe I was able to collate in my mind all the information I have testified to here at that first meeting with them.

Q. Well, now, after this meeting on Saturday, rather, at the end of this meeting on Saturday,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

what arrangements were made, if any, for seeing them again?

A. That meeting ended, to the best of my recollection, on the note that the information I had given them, and which had been then made into notes by Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala, one of them, or both—I don't recall which—that these notes would be made the basis of a statement, that is, transformed into a statement, and then I would meet with them, when they called me to meet with them again, and they would either get any additional facts on the question of Bridges and the Communist Party that I could remember, either do that or else they might have a statement all ready for me to sign then. That is the way I left them.

Q. Were the statements that you gave them in this third meeting any different in substance than what you have testified to here?

A. I haven't—which third meeting are you talking about?

Q. The third all together, which was the first of this year. A. I see what you mean.

Q. I will call it the third meeting. [1609]

A. Were they any different than what I testified to here?

Q. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't believe the witness understands. Do you mean a contradiction to what he has testified to today, or what?

Mr. Grossman: We will see.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I suggest the question, may it please the court, be asked in that manner.

Presiding Inspector: He means different in substance. A. To a certain extent.

Presiding Inspector: He has answered it; to a certain extent, he said.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you recall in what respect it was different?

A. It was not as complete as what I have stated here in that respect. That was the only respect in which it was different. That is, there were different incidents that I have mentioned here that at this first meeting this year with Mr. Madala and Mr. Dickstein that I had not recalled, to the first meeting with them. I hadn't come prepared to make a long statement, and so forth.

Q. At any time after that, that is after the third meeting, or during the third meeting, did any representative of the FBI help you to add details, or fill in details? [1610] A. No.

Q. When did you see them again?

A. I think it was—this was Saturday—I think the next meeting I had with them was Tuesday of the following week, either that or on Monday; I don't recall which.

Q. What happened on the next occasion?

A. On this occasion I again met with them at the office there, and I believe it was on that occasion that they couldn't find a room available where there would be privacy to talk with. All

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

of the desks, and so forth, were occupied. So they suggested I go over to the Olympic Hotel. We went into a room there—I don't know whether it was a room occupied by Mr. Madala as his residence at the time or what, but he was there, and Mr. Dickstein took me over there.

What occurred there was this: That certain details that I hadn't remembered at this previous meeting, the previous Saturday, I did remember; and they took notes on that. They said from the notes they took then, and the notes they had taken the preceding Saturday, they would have a statement prepared and the next time I met them they would ask me to sign that statement if it was what I said.

Q. This meeting in the Olympic Hotel was just a few days after the Saturday meeting, was it not?

A. Yes; just a few days.

Q. Did you see them the next Saturday? [1611]

A. The next what?

Q. The Saturday after the Olympic Hotel meeting, did you see them?

A. Yes. I saw Mr. Dickstein. That was the day I left Seattle to come down here—that was last Saturday—when Mr. Dickstein met me at the train and he came down here too with me.

Q. Did you sign a statement or affidavit on that Saturday after the Olympic Hotel meeting?

A. No; before that Saturday.

Q. How long before that Saturday?

A. Oh, I guess it was either Thursday or Friday.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. The statement had been prepared, hadn't it?

A. The statement, yes.

Q. When you met them? A. Yes.

Q. All told you signed how many statements or affidavits for the FBI? A. One.

Q. Between the second and the third meeting with the FBI you changed your mind about being willing to testify. What was the reason?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, that has been asked and answered. Are we going back over the same thing?

Presiding Inspector: I think I will allow it.

[1612]

Mr. Grossman: It has never been asked and certainly it couldn't have been answered.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead. Don't argue.

A. The reason for this—in the first place, the doubts I had in my mind the previous year as to what the members of my own Newspaper Union in Seattle, the Newspaper Guild, would feel if I did testify or take any part in the Bridges case, that had been dissipated by the fact that on three different occasions requests by the Bridges defense, which was brought into our local, were decisively defeated, that being that the Guild furnish financial and other support to the Bridges Defense Committee. That dissipated my doubts on this question because it showed that the overwhelming majority of the membership would not disapprove of my being here at this hearing. That was one reason.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The second reason was this: In discussing the FBI as an organization with different people I knew in the Guild, and otherwise, I did become convinced that it hadn't been an anti-labor organization; and certainly its activities, as far as I was acquainted with them, and as far as I could check on them through old newspaper files, and so forth, didn't show it had been. So that my testifying here would not mean that I was connecting myself in any way with an anti-labor group.

Those were the major reasons. [1613]

Q. Did you imply by your answer that you had made some check of the newspaper files with reference to the FBI between the second and the third meeting?

A. I believe I could say that between the second and the third meeting, to satisfy my own mind in case I were ever again contacted by anybody from the FBI—to satisfy my own mind I did look through newspaper files, to see if there was any reference to the FBI taking part in any anti-labor activity or acting in any anti-labor method.

Q. Have you ever talked to your employer with reference to whether or not you should testify against Harry Bridges? A. No, I haven't.

Q. When I say "your employer" I mean anyone to whom you are subordinate on the newspaper?

A. No. I haven't talked to them with reference to whether I should testify in this case or not.

Q. In your investigations with reference to the FBI did they include a check on the attitude of

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

the Congress of Industrial Organizations, with reference to the FBI?

A. They didn't have to do that because I—

Q. (Interposing) Just a moment, please! The question is, Did they?

A. They did not. They did not. That is, not the parent body of the CIO.

Q. I am talking about the parent body? [1614]

A. No.

Q. Then you made no check in your analysis of the record of the FBI of the decisions or resolutions of the national body of the CIO, is that correct?

A. That's correct. I didn't make any newspaper check of that.

Q. Did you check before you made up your mind, that you were willing to testify upon any action that might have been taken by the International Union of which you are and were a member?

A. I didn't check because I knew their attitude on it.

Q. And what was it at that time?

A. Well, the attitude of the International office, a letter had been sent out under the name of one of the officials urging our local to aid the Bridges Defense by one of the officials. So I knew the attitude of him as an International officer.

Q. Did you make any check as to the attitude of your International Union with respect to the FBI?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

to this line of questioning. It is not relevant, it is immaterial, and has no—not even a remote connection with the issues involved in this case.

Presiding Inspector: I suppose counsel for the Alien claims that it affects the credibility of this witness.

Mr. Grossman: His state of mind. I don't merely have [1615] to accept the state of mind. I have a right to probe into the reasons he says motivated him to see if they are the real reasons, your Honor. And that is why I am going into it.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, you first bring them out yourself and then you bore into them.

Mr. Grossman: That's right. I can't bore into them without bringing them out.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I know. But if they were brought out by the other side, that would be so. Of course, you can go to a certain extent. Go ahead.

A. Well, in answer to that I made no check—before I can answer it, though, the term "International Union" is a broad one in my mind, too. I don't know whether you mean by that the entire International Union in respect to each local making it up or the International Executive Board of that Union.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. I mean any action taken either by the national Executive Body, which would be the Board, I guess, or conventions of the American Newspaper Guild.

A. On this case?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. Yes. On the FBI. The question deals with the FBI.

A. Oh, on the question of the FBI, yes. I didn't make any check because I was satisfied that I was familiar with the attitude of both the bodies that you mentioned. [1616]

Q. And what did you believe were those attitudes at that time?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, if your Honor please. His beliefs have nothing to do with his credibility on a matter of that kind. Certainly that is a little far-fetched on his credibility.

Presiding Inspector: Pretty remote.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: Pretty remote?

Mr. Grossman: Well, your Honor, his state of mind is not remote and, as I say, I have a right to cross examine—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) His state of mind on irrelevant matter is remote.

Mr. Grossman: Well, he gave this as one of the reasons, your Honor, that he made certain investigations concerning the FBI and had reached certain conclusions. I am going to go into those investigations to see exactly what they were and whether he really made them, as he said, and whether they could have affected the conclusion he says he reached.

Mr. Del Guercio: In view of the statement of counsel—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) In other words,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I am not limited to having him state that he made certain investigations without being able to investigate whether he actually made them and what were the results of his making them.

Presiding Inspector: You are limited to his answers. [1617]

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: You can't contradict them.

Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't know whether these contradict his answers or not.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, I mean to say by other witnesses.

Mr. Grossman: Well, we haven't got into that this time. I am getting more detail at the present time.

Presiding Inspector: If you are laying a foundation for other production of other witnesses, I think it would be useless.

Mr. Grossman: We had better cross that bridge when we come to it.

Presiding Inspector: No, I warn you now.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, I understand.

Presiding Inspector: Then we will follow it as much as we can, the rule of common law, in that respect. Not absolutely, but quite generally.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: But you may examine. I don't think he answered the last question.

Mr. Grossman: Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. I believed that there was no such thing in my International Union, the Guild, as a unanimous attitude on the ques- [1618] tion of the FBI. And I knew for an actual fact that not only was there a question of different locals thinking differently but also within individual locals there would be difference of thought on the question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You detailed certain meetings you had with representatives of the FBI concerning your testifying in this case. Did you have any meetings or discussions or communications with any other representatives or agents of any governmental department or agency concerning this same subject?

A. You mean previous to my coming down to San Francisco with Mr. Dickstein when he took me down?

Q. Well, not only previous to that, but let us say in the last year?

A. Well, before my arrival here, no. Mr. Dickstein and Mr. Madala were the only ones with whom I dealt or met with on this. Since my arrival here, of course, I have talked to Mr. Connolly.

Q. Except for these people and before you came down to San Francisco, did you have any communication at all with any other representative of the Government concerning what you claim to know about Harry Bridges?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, if your Honor please, it has already been asked and answered. He testified he hasn't.

Mr. Grossman: I think this is a more specific question [1619] than the last one.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will allow it.

A. No, I didn't.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you know Mr. Bonham?

A. I have never met him. I know who he is or have an idea who he is.

Q. Do you know Mr. Norene?

A. I have heard his name, but I have never met him.

Q. Mr. Honig, I am concerned some more with this investigation that you carried out between the second and the third conversations with the FBI men; this investigation as to the attitude of certain union groups toward the FBI, or, rather, the reputation of the FBI, I will put it that way. Did you investigate the attitude of any other trade union group except those you have mentioned with respect to the FBI?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, he can answer that "yes" or "no". Did you or didn't you?

A. I—will you repeat it?

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Except for those groups which have already

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

been mentioned, did you investigate the attitude of any other trade union group toward the FBI?

A. Well, I didn't set out to investigate the attitude of [1620] trade union groups towards the FBI.

Q. Did you or didn't you?

A. But of the FBI toward trade unions.

Q. Would you answer that "yes" or "no", please? A. I would have to say "no".

Presiding Inspector: He has intimated that your question is wrong in the first instance.

Mr. Grossman: He has indicated merely—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I mean that your premise is wrong, that he did investigate the attitude of the Labor Unions to the FBI but only as correlative, I suppose.

Mr. Grossman: I think it will change in the next question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you finish your answer that you were giving?

A. Yes. When I stated in the first place, or if I didn't make it clear I meant to say it, is I set out to investigate the attitude of the FBI through newspaper clippings toward the Unions, not the attitude of the Unions toward the FBI.

Q. Did you ever investigate the attitude of the Unions toward the FBI's attitude to them? In other words, their conclusion as to whether the FBI was anti-Union?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Presiding Inspector: You mean unions in general?

Mr. Grossman: Any union body. [1621]

Presiding Inspector: Well,—

A. (Interposing) As a by-product of this other investigation I would naturally look for any references to the FBI in respect to unions and strikes, and so I did keep an eye open for that too.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. All right. Can you tell us which union body's position towards the FBI you examined?

A. I didn't come across any reference in the clippings that I saw or in the newspaper files that I saw to any unions condemning the FBI. I must make it understood that I only went through the files of daily newspapers, not of union newspapers, because they weren't available to me.

Q. Well, I am concerned with whether, Mr. Honig, you made an attempt to get certain kinds of information and the kind I am concerned with now is the kind of information that would develop from trade union bodies passing resolutions or taking other action with respect to the FBI. Did you make any attempt to get that kind of information in your examination?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute!

Presiding Inspector: That is a very broad question, unless he knows more about it than I do. He has only said that he examined newspaper files, and if you mean anything outside of that, of course, you have already got an answer.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Grossman: Well, your Honor, he stated in reply to [1622] the last question—I don't think it is quite responsive, but he stated that it was the only kind of examination that he was able to make.

Presiding Inspector: That is the only thing that he did make.

Mr. Grossman: That is a different question. I want to know whether he——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Of course, he didn't make anything that he wasn't able to make.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: He didn't make any examinations or investigations that he wasn't able to make.

Mr. Grossman: Well, I want to see——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Do you want to ask him that, whether he made any examinations——

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. (Interposing) Did you make any——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Just a moment! Perhaps you had better listen. I said, Do you want me to ask him or you ask him whether he made any investigations which he said he wasn't able to make? Is that the point?

Mr. Grossman: No.

Presiding Inspector: Well, then go on to something else.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you make any investigation except look——

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

ing at the [1623] newspapers in your attempt to find out the attitude of the FBI towards Unions?

A. No, except through personal conversations with individual members of the Guild to find out the typical Guild members' attitude towards it.

Presiding Inspector: That is your own Guild?

The Witness: Yes, my own Newspaper Guild.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Where were you born, Mr. Honig?

A. In New York City.

Q. Were your parents born in this country also?

A. No, they were not.

Q. Do you happen to know when they came to this country? A. Oh, —

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) If your Honor please, I object to that. I don't see any connection—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I will take it: I don't know where it is leading, if anywhere. You may answer.

A. (Continuing) I have an approximate idea. About 1881 or 1880; something like that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. It is a long time ago?

A. A very long time ago. [1624]

Q. You mentioned, in your discussion of Top Fractions in San Francisco, Sunday night as a meeting time for many of these Top Fraction meetings. Do you recall any other night of the week on which these Top Fraction meetings—I think you said of the waterfront—took place?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment, your Honor. We didn't object when counsel changed during the cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: I am going to allow that. Go ahead.

Mr. Del Guercio: It was understood at that time that he wouldn't touch on matters that had been touched on by other counsel.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't understand.

Mr. Del Guercio: That was covered on cross examination by Mr. Gladstein.

Mr. Grossman: I think that is rather a petty objection for this reason: Mr. Gladstein noted that there was one question which hadn't been fully covered. I have at the most three questions on this and then I am through with this phase.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you recall any other night of the week on which these Top Fraction meetings of the water-front groups took place, except Sunday?

A. No, I don't. I don't remember because it was so infrequent that they weren't held on Sunday. [1625]

Q. I see. During the time since you left your position as Editor of the Timber Worker have you ever received unemployment compensation?

A. Yes. I received unemployment compensation during every winter because then I have the status of a part time worker and when I work any week

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

that I earn less than \$15.00 I am entitled to a pro-rata amount of unemployment compensation.

Q. Then you work less at your present job during the winter? A. Yes; much less.

Q. I take it from your answer that you have, therefore, received unemployment compensation during several years?

A. Yes. My recollection is that I have been receiving it during the past winter, and the winter before, and I don't believe I did three winters ago; I am pretty sure of that. When I say "winter," I mean winter and spring; everything but the summer and fall actually.

Q. Mr. Honig, have you received anything whatsoever of value for testifying in this case?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you been promised anything whatsoever of value for testifying in this case?

A. The only thing that I have been told is that my fare and my expenses here as a witness will be covered.

Q. Outside of that, have you been promised any money, [1626] any employment, for testifying in this case? A. None at all.

Q. Have any threats been made against you which would be brought into effect if you did not testify in this case? In other words, has anyone told you that unless you testified certain things will be done, or certain things will be exposed?

A. No.

Q. During the last two or three years—with-

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

draw that. During the period since you left the job with the Timber Worker have you generally agreed or disagreed with the trade union policies of Harry Bridges?

A. For that period after I was no longer connected with the Timber Worker, but still remained a member of the Communist Party, I generally agreed with him, if not in all, in most all of his policies. I say that because I believed he was—well, maybe I shouldn't explain why. Just to answer the question I will say that I did agree with him in many of them in that period that I remained in the Communist Party.

Q. After you left the Party did you agree or disagree generally with the trade union policies of Harry Bridges?

A. Generally I did, but that doesn't mean I did with all of them, or do today.

Q. Has there been any substantial change in your attitude toward his policies as time went on?

A. Yes, I think I should say "yes"; I think I should say "yes" to that question; since I left the Party, yes. [1627]

Q. What change has there been?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that question, if your Honor please. That has no connection at all with this case and is not proper cross examination, and doesn't go to the credibility of the witness.

Presiding Inspector: It may go to the question of bias. I think I will take it. It is a little remote. It may bear on the claim of bias. I will take it.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

"A. My change in attitude toward Harry Bridges' trade union policies—incidentally, I can only base my opinion toward his policies on what I have seen in the newspapers, and I admit that would naturally be a second hand interpretation. I have never discussed with him what his policies are. But from what I have seen of his actions described in the newspapers, and his policies at conventions, and so forth, in general his policies, my change has occurred in trying, as a man interested in the trade union movement, trying to analyze just where I felt he was changing in his trade union policies. In other words, I had begun to feel more and more in the last two or three years that Harry Bridges is following a certain type of policy followed by the Communist Party, that is, paralleling the Communist Party in the last two or three years—I say in the last two years—which leads away from the idea of labor unity, unity in the labor movement, that is, the CIO and the A. F. of L. becoming reunited. I have felt that [1628] Bridges has not any longer—this is my personal opinion—any longer during, or any longer is desirous of seeing such unity brought about.

That is the major change in my mind as far as my opinion of his policies are concerned in the trade union field.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Is it your conclusion, though, that Mr. Bridges is adopting a policy that is independent,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

or is the policy of the CIO National—do you have a conclusion on that?

A. I understand what you mean. It is my conclusion that he is adopting a policy that is in harmony with some officials, national officials of the CIO as a central organization, and not in harmony with perhaps other officials, International officials—National officials and not International—Nationals officials of the CIO.

Q. Do you feel that the position of Mr. Bridges is in harmony, and with which you are now in disagreement, with the resolutions of the CIO conventions—

A. (Interposing) With the CIO?

Q. (Continuing) Just a minute—that his position is in harmony with the resolutions of the CIO conventions, and of the CIO Executive Board, National Executive Board?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that question.

Presiding Inspector: Doesn't that have to do with the determination of what those are? [1629]

Mr. Grossman: Not if he says they are in agreement, there is no necessity. I think that may be his answer.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a chance on it and see.

A. The only way I can answer that question is that I know, to my knowledge, there are a great, great many resolutions that have come out of CIO conventions, and the National Executive Board meetings, and perhaps Mr. Bridges policies are in

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

line with some of those, and perhaps not with others; but I have to be asked about specific resolutions. Then I would rather like to see those resolutions before me before I could answer a question like that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You stated that your ways, that is, your views, yours and Mr. Bridges, have begun to part company. Can you give us some specific example of trade union positions or theories upon which you and Mr. Bridges now, or in the last year or so, have disagreed?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that question. The witness testified to no such thing, and there hasn't been any such falling apart. They were never together.

Presiding Inspector: I think he has testified to something that I think would be an answer to the question.

Mr. Del Guercio: Are we going all over the same thing again? [1630].

Presiding Inspector: Hasn't he said that Mr. Bridges favored a separatist attitude while he favored a general united attitude on the part of labor, the labor field?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, in general. I was asking for—

Presiding Inspector: That answers your question.

Mr. Grossman: Not specifically. In other words,

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

I would like to know if there are any specific issues which he can point out.

Presiding Inspector: "Issues" probably isn't the right word.

Mr. Grossman: I want some concrete things, concrete situations which arise, and resolutions, for example, where he and Mr. Bridges disagreed.

Presiding Inspector: The only thing you are interested in is the attitude of this witness' mind, isn't it?

Mr. Grossman: Correct.

Presiding Inspector: Haven't you got it?

Mr. Grossman: I don't think so because the particular situation—

Presiding Inspector: Can you particularize?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

The Witness: Yes, I think I can.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.

The Witness: I will try to in my own way. My answer will have to be something like this: I don't know personally [1631] what Mr. Bridges' individual attitude and policies are. I have never discussed them with him. I haven't seen him since I left California. I only know from what I have read what would happen in the newspapers at the ILWU Convention, for instance, which seemed to me to indicate what Mr. Bridges' belief was concerning trade union procedure or policy, tactical strategy. Of course, in reading that I knew what my opinion was on such a thing. Now, as to whether I differed

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

with Mr. Bridges on that, it isn't a question—I couldn't answer that I differed personally, as a person would with Mr. Bridges, as an individual person on these things; but in trying to make a cold analysis of a particular theory of trade union practice, or of a particular action in carrying out trade union practice, I could say just cold objectively I didn't agree with maybe something Mr. Bridges was quoted as having said in a newspaper. At the same time I couldn't say definitely that what the newspaper quoted him as having said he actually did say.

Presiding Inspector: The witness has said he thinks he disagrees in the respect mentioned, but he hasn't sufficient information to tell what Mr. Bridges' attitude actually was objectively.

Mr. Grossman: I have one more minor question with respect to these Fraction meetings, Top Fraction meetings, that was left untouched, and that is the last question.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. [1632]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Honig, did these Top Fraction meetings that you described in San Francisco take place at the same time of the day usually?

A. Generally they were called, and it was the desire to have them start at the same time which, to the best of my recollection, would be 8:00 P. M. or 8:30. But naturally they would have to wait before they started until a sufficient number had arrived.

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Q. They were always in the evenings, were they?

A. Nearly every one that I can remember were in the evening. There might have been one or two that were in the afternoon on Sunday, but I wouldn't state positively that is so.

Mr. Grossman: No more questions.

Presiding Inspector: Any further questions, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: I have a few questions, if your Honor please.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Honig, was there any question in your mind, during the entire time that you were a member of the Communist Party, that the Communist Party did advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence? [1633]

A. There was no question in my mind about that, about the fact that they did so advocate.

Q. Was there any question in your mind, during the time that you were a member of the Communist Party, that the Communist Party circulated and distributed literature advocating and teaching the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

A. I knew that such literature was distributed by the Communist Party.

Q. Now, I believe you said something about 75 per cent—I don't exactly recall your testimony in that connection—but you used the term "75 per

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

cent" when counsel asked you about the use of force and violence. Just what did you mean by that?

A. What I said, what I believe I said, and what I meant to say, was this: That I was telling that I had discussed with leaders of the Communist Party this question of whether force and violence would be necessary to achieve social change. I think I was asked what my attitude was when I was a member of the Communist Party, say, for the first years I was a member, and I replied this way: As far as my mind, attitude of mind was concerned, I felt 75 per cent—this is my personal mind—75 per cent were satisfied that such social change could be achieved without resort to force and violence, but about 25 per cent, in my mind, felt that it could not be done and to that extent I felt that if it couldn't be I would [1634] subscribe to the idea that force and violence would be necessary.

Q. Did any top leader, high functionary of the Communist Party, ever tell you, or ever say in your presence, that the Communist Party of the United States and any of its affiliated organizations, did not believe in or advocate, or teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?

A. No, no top party leader ever said that.

Presiding Inspector: Let me see if I understand this. You think it is your attitude that the chances are about three to one that the dictatorship of the proletariat could be put into effect by the consent of all the people?

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

The Witness: It was my attitude when I was a Party member, yes; but not now.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, you mentioned a Mr. Pritchett as being connected with the Timber Worker, or as being the President of the Union that controlled the Timber Worker. Was Mr. Pritchett a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was when I was.

Q. And you also mentioned a Mr. Orton. Is Mr. Orton, or was he a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. Grossman: I object to the question as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial. I think I am correct in saying that [1635] neither this witness, or anyone else, has put Mr. Orton in any of these meetings. If that is so the ground of relevancy that your Honor discussed before would not apply.

Mr. Del Guercio: It wasn't in connection with a meeting. It was in connection with his working on the Timber Worker.

Presiding Inspector: If he knows whether he is a member of the Communist Party I will allow him to answer, and leave it to you to cross examine as to the source.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is your answer?

A. I know Mr. Orton was a member of the

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

Communist Party when I was with the Timber Worker. [1636]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. With reference to the discussions that took place at these top fraction meetings, in answer to one of Counsel's questions I believe you stated that instructions had been sent down from the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party to the effect that the membership should strive to have all unions, particularly longshoremen, break away from the American Federation of Labor and affiliate with the CIO. Is that correct?

A. Not exactly. But I was referring specifically and only to the longshoremen on the Pacific Coast, not all unions.

Q. Only to the longshoremen. And that such instructions had come from the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party?

A. That the Communist Party members amongst the longshoremen on the West Coast should work toward that aim.

Q. And I believe you testified that the discussions along that line in these top fraction meetings were to ratify such action. What do you mean by that, by "ratify" the action that had already been taken by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party?

A. What I meant by that was this: That at Communist Party meetings of fractions and unions on major questions they weren't given the choice

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

of either voting "Yes" or "No" or originating a certain basic major policy, but it would come [1637] already decided upon from the Central Committee of the Communist Party to this lower body, the fraction or the Party unit. It would be tossed in there as an accomplished fact and the unit or the fraction would understand that they had the right to talk about it and discuss how it should be put into application, but as far as voting as to whether that was the be the policy, the only thing that would be done about it, there would be a formal acceptance of it, a formal vote on ratifying something that had already been voted by the higher body of the Communist Party. If the unit, the Party unit or the Party fraction—I never heard of such a case happening all the time I was in the Party—but if it had rejected such a major policy or change of policy that came from the Central Committee of the Party, that wouldn't have invalidated that policy decided on by the Central Committee. It would have simply brought a man out from the Central Committee to that group to find out what was wrong, how such a situation could occur. I never heard of it occurring.

Q. Then you didn't mean that the action of the Central Committee in connection with that matter was ratified by these fraction meetings?

A. That was a term that would be used on any major policy that was discussed in a party membership meeting. Whether it was correctly used or

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

not, in party terminology the word used was that the unit or the fraction would "ratify" a certain decision already made. [1638]

Q. During any of these meetings were persons present asked to give financial assistance to maintain the Western Worker?

A. Yes. That was incidentally a topic that occasionally came up at these top fraction meetings, the necessity to obtain financial support from Communist Party members for the Western Worker and, if possible, also from non-Communist Party members; that is, the Communist Party meetings would try to get such contributions from the others.

Q. Were contributions made for the Western Workers in such meetings? A. What is that?

Q. Were contributions made for the Western Worker in such meetings?

A. Oh, there were times at the top fraction meetings when they would all chip in and give something for it, or perhaps put up some money in order to buy a bundle of the Western Worker or to pay for a bundle of it to be distributed on the waterfront.

Q. The Western Worker at that time was the official organ of the Communist Party?

A. For the West Coast. [1639]

Q. Were any collections made at such meetings for the Communist Party?

A. Yes, in this sense there were: It was the desire of the Communist Party district office, District Committee, that longshoremen particularly, since

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

they were earning higher wages than many other fields of work, should donate a certain amount, a certain, what was called "subsidy" towards paying the expenses of the Communist Party district office, and often the particular amount agreed upon by the individual member was handed to whatever representative of the District Committee was present at that particular top fraction meeting.

Q. Did you ever see Mr. Bridges here contribute either to the Western Worker or to the Communist Party at any of these meetings?

A. I won't say definitely that I did. I have seen others, but I won't say in that respect that I have seen Mr. Bridges do that.

Q. The name Pastch was brought out by Counsel here.

Mr. Gladstein: What?

Mr. Del Guercio: Pastch; P-a-s-t-c-h.

A. Oh, Pastch.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Victor Pastch. A. Yes.

Q. Who is he?

A. He's the International Treasurer—Secretary—
[1640] Treasurer, I believe is the official title—of the American Newspaper Guild.

Q. Is he also a member of the Communist Party?

A. To my knowledge he is, yes.

Q. Do you know Meyer Balen?

A. No, I don't believe I have ever met him. I

(Testimony of Nat Honig.)

have heard the name, but I don't believe I have met him.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

Mr. Gladstein: We have no further questions.

Presiding Inspector: You may leave the stand.

Mr. Del Guercio: May the witness be excused, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: I would like to have you hold him until the close of this session today. Then there is a matter which Mrs. King brought to my attention and I want to talk it over with Counsel for the Government before Mr. Honig is excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a short recess?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Mr. Del Guercio: The next witness will be in shortly.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. Very well. [1641]

ROBERT PATRICK WILMOT

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is your name?

A. Robert Patrick Wilmot.

Q. Where were you born, Mr. Wilmot?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Butte, Montana.

Q. And what is your present occupation?

A. I am employed by the Woodworker, which is a paper published by the International Woodworkers of America, in Portland, Oregon.

Q. How long have you held such position?

A. I started in there, I believe, January 16.

Q. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Wilmot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you join the Communist Party?

A. Shortly after Christmas in 1927.

Q. And under what circumstances did you join?

A. Well, I was approached—I was then employed on the Writers' Project and I was approached by a Kenneth Fitzgerald in Portland, who several times solicited me to join. And I finally did.. [1642]

Q. What was Kenneth Fitzgerald doing at that time?

A. He was employed as a supervisor on the Historical Records Survey, which was a contiguous project, you might say. We worked in together.

Q. That was a WPA Project?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And was he a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was a former Candidate for office on the Communist ticket.

Q. Under what name did you join the Communist Party?

A. W. P. Ayer.

Q. Why did you use the name of "W. P. Ayer"?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Well, I was told not to use my right name and, frankly, it struck me a little funny at the time. So I used that name.

Q. Were you given any assignments by the Communist Party?

A. Well, my first assignment was to write publicity for the North American Committee to aid Spanish Democracy.

Q. The North American Committee to aid Spanish Democracy? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who gave you such an assignment?

A. James Murphy, the Secretary of the Communist Party there in Portland.

Q. What else did James Murphy do besides being Secretary of the Communist Party at that time?

A. I wouldn't know that. [1643]

Q. Was he a member of any union?

A. I think he had been a member of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union when they were A. F. of L., and I believe that after they went CIO that he still paid his dues for a while, but he certainly wasn't working in the industry.

Q. Now, when Murphy gave you these instructions did he tell you anything else?

A. Well, he told me to keep my identity secret in there and not let anybody know I was a Communist.

Q. Did he tell you why you should conceal your identity as a Communist?

A. I was definitely instructed at that time to keep my identity concealed at all times.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Were you given any other assignments other than the one you have just mentioned?

A. Well, I—being a comparative newcomer, on several occasions I was sent out to, oh, rent halls and, for instance, some friends of the Soviet Union had a meeting there and they were having some difficulties with the School Board in getting permission to use one of the auditoriums there for a meeting at which Anna Louise Strong spoke, particularly. And I was sent up to make the application because of the fact that I was so recently in Portland that nobody knew that I was a Communist.

Q. Did you ever do any work for the Labor New Dealer? [1644]

A. Yes, sir. I was the Editor of the Labor New Dealer in Portland for about a year and two months.

Q. Who put you on the Labor New Dealer, if anyone?

A. Definitely the Communist Party. And I was approached at my house, asked to take over the job, by Fitzgerald and a longshoreman named Harry Pilcher, and the unit to which I belonged, which was composed of writers and artists, selected me to take over the job. And I had previously joined the Newspaper Guild and Pilcher and Fitzgerald came out to my house one night and asked me if I would take the job. And I said I would do so if they could get it for me, and they said that "It was in the bag."

Q. Was Harry Pilcher a member of the Commu-

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

nist Party at that time? A. Definitely.

Q. What were your duties as—did you say you were Managing Editor of the Labor New Dealer?

A. I was the entire staff as far as that was concerned.

Q. You were what?

A. I was the entire staff.

Q. You were the entire staff. A one-man paper?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And by whom were your wages to be paid, if any?

A. They were to be paid by the Industrial—I believe it was the Unity Council at that time, and the paper was to [1645] pay me on bundle order subscriptions, and as the money came in and also advertising, and we had no advertising man when we started. We soon got an advertising man and acquired a stenographer and acquired a business man, after which I never got paid.

Q. What were your wages when you did get paid?

A. Dick Sellers, the International Organizer for the Newspaper Guild, said that I was to be paid \$30.00 a week every week. But I only got that for a couple of weeks.

Q. And then what did you get the rest of the time?

A. Oh, car fare and lunch money; maybe four or five dollars a week.

Q. And how many hours a day did you work?

A. Well, I worked, in order to support my family, I had to go back on WPA and I still got out the

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmo.)

paper. I imagine that my average was about fifteen or sixteen hours a day for a year.

Q. Fifteen or sixteen hours a day?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the most you ever got for that was \$30.00 a week?

A. That's for—

Q. (Interposing): And you only got that for a few weeks?

A. I believe three weeks.

Q. And the rest of the time you averaged how much? [1646]

A. Well, when I took time off on WPA I couldn't turn my time in there, so I think I had a grand average of about \$16.00 a week in all that time.

Q. Now, during the time that you were editing this Labor New Dealer did you ever meet Harry Bridges?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recognize Harry Bridges?

A. Indeed.

Q. He is here in this Court room?

A. Right there (Indicating).

Q. When did you first meet Harry Bridges?

A. I believe that it was the week after the first issue of the paper came out. I went to work on the paper four days before the first of October, and the first issue came out the first day of October in 1937, and a week later Bridges attended a meeting of the Longshoremen's Union in Portland and Harry Pilcher took me over and got me in the meeting, and I met Harry Bridges on the stage of the Norse Hall in Portland shortly after the meeting adjourned.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. What kind of a meeting was that?

A. That was a meeting of the Longshoremen's Union.

Q. Longshoremen's Union? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And who introduced you to Bridges?

A. Harry Pilcher. [1647.]

Q. What did he say when he introduced him, if he said anything?

A. Well, he sidled up to Bridges and he said "This is the new editor of the paper wanting to meet you". And I shook hands with Mr. Bridges.

Q. Did Mr. Bridges say anything?

A. What is that?

Q. Did Mr. Bridges say anything?

A. Yes, he facetiously remarked "Is this one of those terrible Communists?" or something.

Q. Now, had Harry Pilcher told in introducing you to Bridges, had he told Bridges that you were a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you meet Mr. Bridges any other time?

A. I believe Mr. Bridges was up in our office the next day after that longshore meeting, in which Pilcher and I and some other Communists went in the inner office and talked more about the paper. And I asked—I believe I asked Bridges what his idea on policy and so forth was on the thing, and we had quite a discussion there. And during that time that—

Q. (Interposing): Was Harry Bridges a member of that union that was putting out this paper?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. This paper was put out by ostensibly all the unions in Portland. The Communist control of it was kept entirely [1648] secret. It was backed in the beginning by the legitimate CIO Unions in that area.

Q. And was Harry Bridges connected with any of those unions in Portland?

A. Not in Portland.

Q. And did you have any conversation with Bridges at that time? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What was the conversation?

A. One thing came up, that I had been in Minneapolis, Minnesota during the Teamsters' strike and Pileher remarked to Bridges in a laughing way that I had known Barney Mayes, at which time Mr. Bridges wanted to know whether I was a "Trotskyite" or not.

Q. And what did you say?

A. I said I definitely wasn't or I wouldn't have been where I was.

Q. Who was Barney Mayes?

A. Barney Mayes was—I wasn't asked whether I knew him—was a man who was—I believe he is an ex-convict that was in Minneapolis for some time at the same time that I was active around there. I never got to know him, but Mayes came out on the Coast before I got here and I believe achieved something of a reputation for being an anti-Communist before he got there, and I know that I heard people attribute [1649] the way he felt to the Stalin-Trotsky split in the Party. And that's just about

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

all I could say about that, except that I know that he was at one time connected with the Dunne Brothers in Minneapolis.

Q. And because you had come from Minneapolis Bridges asked you if you were a Trotskyite? A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever meet Bridges again after that?

A. Yes, sir. I met him several times when he came through Portland, occasionally in the Longshoremen's office, I believe once; on another occasion in E. B. O'Grady's office. And Mr. O'Grady was at that time the Regional Director for the State of Oregon, and I sat in on some meetings at which Mr. Bridges had some discussions with men from the Columbia River District Council No. 5, which is the coordinating council for the Sawmill-Lumber and Sawmill Workers in that area. And, I might say that Mr. Bridges also told me that we'd—as far as the paper was concerned, that we ought to get—use the paper to “get” a couple of people there, one named Donald Helmig, one named Alfred Hartung. These are a couple who were leading and still are leading an anti-Communist fight in Oregon. [1650]

Q. When Bridges said “We ought to get”—who did he mean by “we”?

A. The newspaper—Pilcher and Mowrey.

Q. No, no—perhaps you misunderstood the question. When Bridges said “We ought to get so and so on the paper,” who did he mean by “we”?

A. It was merely a colloquial expression. I said,

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

"How do you think we ought to handle this paper?"

Obviously, I knew who was calling the shots on it.

I said, "How do you think we ought to handle this? What should the policy be?"

He said, "We ought to use it to get these phonies in the lumber workers across the river."

Q. Did you believe that Bridges was a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. That is how I understood it.

Q. Was there any question in your mind about his being a member of the Communist Party at that time? A. No doubt whatever.

Q. Did you ever attend any Communist Party meetings in which Bridges was present at any time?

A. I never sat in any meeting, with the exception of the one with the lumber workers, with Mr. Bridges where there was anyone else present besides Communists.

Q. Did you attend a meeting in the Lennox Hotel in [1651] Portland, Oregon, on or about April 1 or April 2, 1938, in the afternoon?

A. I did.

Q. What kind of a meeting was that?

A. Well, that was a Fraction meeting of the Top Fraction of Portland, of the Communist Party, which was called to discuss various issues.

Q. Who called the meeting?

A. Well, I was merely approached by Harry Pilcher and told to be there. I am not absolutely certain who called the meeting.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Did Harry Pilcher tell you what kind of meeting was to be held at the New Lennox Hotel?

A. Well, it wasn't necessary. He said, "We will have a Fraction meeting in the Lennox Hotel this afternoon."

Q. Did he say who would be there?

A. Yes. He mentioned that specifically; told me to go out and get a couple of Communist Members and have them there; that is, if I saw them to be sure and have them there.

Q. Did you get in touch with them?

A. I did.

Q. Who?

A. I got in touch with James Fantz, a Portland longshoreman, and I got in touch with Leo Hemingway, a warehouseman, a member of Local 1-28.

Q. And you took them to the New Lennox Hotel to that [1652] meeting?

A. Yes. We went up together.

Q. Who was there when you arrived?

A. Mr. Bridges was there when I first came in.

Q. Anyone else?

A. There were eight or nine people whom I was—I might say by this time I had been transferred into the Waterfront Branch of the Communist Party, and there were seven or eight members of that Waterfront Branch present when I got there.

Q. Waterfront Section, you mean, of the Communist Party?

A. Waterfront Branch. That was a branch which took in the longshoremen, the sailors, of which

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

there were few, warehousemen and various other people that they might designate, such as the Marine Cooks and Stewards, and so on. I was Editor of the Labor New Dealer. That was where the news came from. The decisions of that branch was what made the news as far as I was concerned.

Q. You weren't a waterfront worker at that time, were you? A. No, sir.

Q. And you say—I don't believe you answered my question. Was it a waterfront section of the Communist Party?

A. Waterfront branch; yes.

Q. Waterfront branch of the Communist Party?

[1653]

A. Waterfront Section; yes.

Q. They were all members of the Communist Party?

A. There were some men there that I didn't know. But there were two men there that I didn't know, but the rest of them were.

Q. Now, when you arrived at the Lennox Hotel—by the way, what time of day did you arrive there?

A. Well, I had my lunch and it was early in the afternoon.

Q. Where did you go?

A. I didn't hear that.

Q. Where did you go when you went to the Lennox Hotel?

A. Where we went to—Mr. Bridges left, with one heavily built man. Joe Ring took us down into

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

another room. I believe it was on the same floor and if I remember rightly it was on the fourth floor. We all sat around on the floor, and a couple of us were on the bed, and started to have this meeting.

Q. Did you say Bridges left? A. Yes.

Q. What did he say, if anything, before he left?

A. He said that "Jo-Jo will tell you what to do."

Q. Who was "Jo-Jo"? A. Joe Ring.

Q. Who was Joe Ring? [1654]

A. Joe Ring was, as I understand, a San Francisco longshoreman at that time who had been identified to me by several people as Bridges' body-guard.

Q. You named James Fantz and Leo Hemingway as being there, and Joe Ring. Were any others there?

A. Harry Pilcher, was there, Jack Mowrey, a Portland longshoreman and communist, was there. John Fantz, a brother of James, was there. John Fongerouse, now Secretary of the Portland Industrial Union Council, was there.

Q. Do you know if he is under deportation proceedings at the present time?

A. I heard that he was under deportation proceedings; but I heard he paid a fine and the case was dismissed.

Q. You have reference to a criminal proceeding, don't you? A. In Los Angeles; yes, sir.

Q. Was Tom Burns there?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Thomas Burns was there.

Q. And what was discussed at this meeting?

A. Well, first of all—I will try and tell you.

Q. I will withdraw that question. Let me ask you this question first: Were all the persons that you have mentioned as being present at that meeting members of the Communist Party?

A. That was definitely a Party meeting; yes, sir.

Q. No question about that? [1655]

A. No sir.

Q. What was discussed at this meeting?

A. Well, Joe Ring appointed a Chariman first. He appointed James Fantz as Chairman. The whole matter under discussion was the matter of getting rid of Captain E. B. O'Grady, who was the CIO Regional Director for Portland, and his assistant, John Brost.

They decided that it would be easier to get rid of Brost first and let O'Grady stay for a while. By doing that they could get rid of O'Grady.

It happened that I made some objections to this because I said that the lumber workers whom I had to contact every week, as Editor of the paper, would go right square off the reservation if we did that, and kick over the applecart.

But Ring and Pilcher, and the rest of them, said that Brost was definitely going anyway and that I was to be his successor.

I brought up the point that I never had any organizational experience. They said "No, but you

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

write the stuff we want written and we will help you organize."

I brought out the fact that John Brost was a friend of mine and I didn't like this sort of procedure. We had a terrific argument about it.

Finally I asked them if Bridges could get Brost and O'Grady removed and Ring just laughed and said, "Of course he [1656] can. That is what this meeting is called for."

So we talked it over for some time and we took a vote on it, on who would be Brost's successor. They all voted for me. I didn't vote for myself. They told me there was a \$60.00 a week salary in connection with it, and everything.

I said "Yes, but I would only get it for about one week and then we would have five thousand loggers with calked boots on us."

Ring finally said, "I have told you what you are to do. By God, I want you to do what I have told you in this instance."

The final decision of this Fraction was that I was to go into Brost's place and Brost was to be removed as soon as possible. I believe Ring stated that he would be out within three weeks.

Q. After the meeting what did you do?

A. Some time during that 24 hours Ring and I talked to Bridges about my qualifications. I believe that was at the Roosevelt Hotel after the meeting.

I had worked all night the night before getting out, working on a sheet, and I don't remember exactly how we contacted Bridges. Anyway, he said Bridges

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

would take care of it and that he would tell Bridges that I was to be the successor to John Brost.

Q. Did you talk to Bridges at any time after that meeting about what had occurred there? [1657]

A. After that meeting?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. There was an open meeting around the first—a closed meeting around the first of April, at which they were to iron out differences between the Lumber & Sawmill Workers and—the Longshoremen. This all went, I might say, definitely into the fight between the Communists and the anti-Communists on the Portland waterfront. It was at this meeting that I contacted Bridges again.

Q. Who went with you, if anyone?

A. Harry Jackson and Harry Pincher.

Q. Who was Harry Jackson?

A. Harry Jackson was at that time the trade union organizer for the whole west coast, I believe, of the Communist Party; at least that is the way he impressed himself on me because he called the shots so far as the trade union policies were concerned.

Q. Where did you go to see Bridges?

A. Up to the Roosevelt Hotel.

Q. When was that? A. At night.

Q. When was it, what month, year, date?

A. That was right around the first of April.

Q. After the meeting? A. Yes. [1658]

Q. What was said at that meeting?

A. Well, first of all, I think this is significant because I had been in some difficulties with the Party

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

for not hewing to the line. In fact, I had been up in front of the Control Commission and they had asked me what I intended to do. One of the matters that we were discussing was the fact that some of the Portland Police were supposed to go over and raid the Communist headquarters and take some stuff out of there, or something. So Murphy told around, and he told me I would have to run a statement by the Communists in the Labor New Dealer, and which I declined to do: I said I wouldn't run such a statement. They made me run it.

So at that time, after I ran it, then I guess all was forgiven, or something. So this night after this closed meeting—Harry Jackson wasn't allowed in the meeting. People were supposed to have Union cards to get in there. It was in the Portland auditorium. He was outside waiting when Pilcher and I came out. He said, "I am going to take Bob up and bust him on Harry Bridges."

So we went over to the Roosevelt Hotel. Mr. Bridges talked to me at the time and said that I ought to behave myself, and said "We Communists have got to stick together. If we don't what sort of discipline will we have in our organization?"

So Pilcher then said that he didn't think they would have any more trouble with me; that I would behave myself. [1659]

I didn't stay there very long. I left.

Q. That statement that you referred to, that you ran in the Labor Herald, that was a statement made by whom?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilnot.)

A. It was written, brought up to me in the Labor New Dealer Office by a fellow named Van Lydegraff—V-a-n L-y-d-e-g-r-a-f-f—and Clayton is his first name. He had been a Party functionary for several years. I believe at that time he was Chairman of the Control Commission of the Multnomah County Section of the Communist Party. He just brought the statement in and said, 'Well, here is a statement.' [1660]

I didn't bother to argue it with him. I was going to carry it further than that. So I took the statement. So I took the statement to Murphy. That was the way it started.

Q. To go back to the time you and Harry Jackson and Pilcher were talking to Mr. Bridges, are you sure that Bridges said to you "We Communists must stick together," or words to that effect?

A. There wouldn't have been any point, the way Jackson brought me in there, if you understand that Jackson never worked out in the open anywhere. He is what you might call a hatchet man, and he comes down the line and gives the orders. And when he said "bust me on Harry Bridges" he meant he was going to impose upon me the trust of taking me into Bridges and his august presence. That is what it amounted to. He certainly never done anything like that before. Pilcher, or none of the rest of them, had ever made any bones about the fact that Bridges was a Communist. Jackson, I don't know whether he, what he was doing, whether he was

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilnot.)

trying me out, or what, but he wanted me definitely to get back on the reservation, as he put it.

I had asked him to let me quit and get out of the thing; that I didn't want to run the statement. They wouldn't do that. But they had all been in a placative mood.

Q. You said Bridges said to you, "We Communists must stick together?" [1661]

A. He said, 'Why didn't I behave myself. Maybe I would like to go to San Francisco and work on a good paper.'

Q. Did he say "We Communists must stick together?"

A. Yes; he definitely did.

Q. Did he say anything about yielding to some kind of discipline?

A. He said—yes, he said "Everybody has to have discipline if we are going to have any organization of any kind." I believe he said, "I heard some bad reports about you." Then he said "We have got to all yield to discipline."

Jackson said he thought I would be all right.

Q. Concerning the writing of this statement of Van Lydegraff in the Labor Herald, did Bridges discuss with you the advisability of running that statement?

A. Yes. I exploded. I said, "I don't want to run it because"—I will tell you what happened just that time.

"The Lumber Workers served notice on me that if I didn't get the Communist propaganda out of that

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

paper that everyone of them were going to cancel their subscription to the paper. They did just about that time.

I went over and asked them, I said, "Give me a chance. The CIO should have a paper."

Right on the heels of that along comes this statement from Van Lydegraff.

Incidentally, after that I lost another thousand [1662] subscriptions after that statement appeared.

Q. What did Bridges say to you, if anything?

A. He said that he thought I ought to run it.

Q. Did he say why you should?

A. Not at that time; no.

Q. When did you run that statement of Van Lydegraff's?

A. That was run—I don't know when, but the files are available.

Q. Do you think it was about April 21, 1938, in the issue of the Labor New Dealer?

For the purpose of refreshing your memory I will show you a Portland, Oregon, Friday, April 22, 1938, issue of the Labor New Dealer, and will ask you if the statement you are talking about appears in that issue?

A. (Examining newspaper) No. This is entirely different. I remember this because this affected me so vitally. This is an entirely different incident. It has nothing to do with the Van Lydegraff statement.

I can tell you about this if you want.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Tell us about this then, if it has any connection with Bridges.

A. All right. This is a headline here which says, "Bridges in City Answers Blast of Carson, Keegan."

I was over making my paper up and I received a phone call—this would have been on this issue—that was right after that decision of the Supreme Court in Louisiana by the Judge [1663] who said that membership in the Communist Party was no basis for deportation.

So I was instructed by Bridges in our office, to write that editorial that is in there, and I was also instructed on those facts, and he said, "Now is our chance. The Communist Party is coming in the open around here. We have a chance now to answer—those things."

He told me everything to write that is in that statement about the Portland Red Squad there, and told me everything to write, the main outlines in this editorial.

I was also told, in fact every Communist in town was telling me what I should have in that editorial.

Q. The editorial that you have reference to, is that the one that appears at the top of the page here in this issue?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Headed "And Who Wants Harry Bridges Deported."

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say Harry Bridges told you to write that?

A. I was over in the office and they called up and

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

told me to come over there. I had not written that at the time.

Bridges was then in E. B. O'Grady's office in the Guardian Building.

I didn't go over right away and they sent a Portland longshoreman over—I didn't know his name—to get me. [1664] So Bridges told me what should go in these two articles.

Q. Did he also tell you the heading of this article here, "And Who Wants Harry Bridges Deported?"

A. It was suggested by one of the boys; I don't remember which.

Q. And you say he suggested also that you write this other article that you referred to here under the heading "Bridges, in City Answers Blasts of Carson and Keegan?"

A. He said that Keegan, or the Portland Police force, and these fellows had been keeping 40 or 50, I think, stool pigeons around there waiting for his deportation charges to come up. I had no other facts on the matter than as he gave them to me.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, of your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: Have you shown it to counsel?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Received without objection.

(The newspaper referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 245.)

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. When did you discontinue your relations with the Labor New Dealer, Mr. Wilmot?

A. I walked out there on the first of December, 1938; but they kept my name on the masthead for several months afterwards without my consent.

[1665]

Q. You walked out of there—what do you mean by that?

A. Well, right after the 1938 elections I submitted my resignation to the Communist Party, and James Murphy came around the next day, and said that he had torn up the resignation. I said that I still didn't want the paper anymore, and I gave them, I think, two weeks to get a successor. So they sent down to San Francisco and got a fellow by the name of Lee Coe—C-o-e—and as soon as he arrived, the very day he got there, I threw across the keys at him and walked out. [1666]

Q. You say you sent in your resignation also to the Communist Party?

A. Right after, yes; about, oh, I think along about the first of November, 1938.

Q. Have you ever been arrested, Mr. Wilmot?

A. Several times.

Q. For what?

A. Well, the last time I was arrested was during the goon round-up in Portland on an after-hours charge. I was carrying a lot of literature and what-not. I was released in the morning; never came to trial.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. What kind of literature were you carrying?

A. Well, I had some, oh, pamphlets of various sorts. I don't recall exactly now what they were.

Q. When was that? A. Sir?

Q. What year was that?

A. That was about February, 1937.

Q. Have you ever been convicted of any crime?

A. When I was a boy I drove an automobile while drunk, when I was about 17, and I got thirty days in the workhouse for that.

Q. What were you convicted of?

A. What is that?

Q. What were you convicted of? [1667]

A. Of driving while drunk.

Q. Driving while drunk? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you were a boy? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever been arrested at any other time and convicted?

A. No, sir. Well, I was picked up during some labor trouble in Minneapolis and released.

Q. You have a relief record, too, haven't you?

A. A relief record?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir; as long as your arm. I have got considerable of relief.

Q. You had that relief record when you went into the Communist Party?

A. Yes, sir. You see, I went on the Writer's Project from the relief rolls. I was on this transient relief and I always thought it was illegal, but they told me to go to work. And so I went to work. I mean, I thought there was some technicality that

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

somebody slipped up, but I went on the Writer's Project. Then after I was there they took me off the relief status and promoted me to non-relief status.

Q. And you had that relief record when you met Mr. Bridges, didn't you? [1668]

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had that criminal record when you met Bridges? A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Del Guercio: You may cross examine.

Mr. Gladstein: I realize that there are ten minutes before the day is over, but your Honor suggested a conference.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I did.

Mr. Gladstein: And we could not finish in ten minutes with the witness, and we would like permission for that reason to begin our cross examination in the morning.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think we could start, if your Honor please.

Mr. Gladstein: The reason I ask that, if we are going to have a conference and if it is going to take any time it will, of course, cut into the time we were planning to conduct the cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: The witness will have to stay over anyway.

Mr. Del Guercio: But just in the interest of time here, that is all.

Mr. Gladstein: We will agree to go ten minutes longer tomorrow and make that up, if that is satisfactory.

Presiding Inspector: All right. Tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon at 3:50 P. M. an adjournment was taken to Wednesday, April 23, 1941, at 10:00 A. M.) [1669]

Court Room 276,
Federal Building,
San Francisco, California,
April 23, 1941.

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A.M.

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

ROBERT PATRICK WILMOT

called as a witness on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Cross Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Wilmot, I understood you to say, and the transcript reports you as having said, that you joined the Communist Party in 1927, is that correct?

A. No, sir. 1937, is what I said.

Q. The only thing that was wrong then was the year, and it would be also after Christmas?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. After Christmas, that is, of 1937, is that the correct time that you joined the Communist Party?

A. To the best of my memory I joined right after Christmas in 1937.

Q. When did you leave the Communist Party?

A. I submitted my resignation to the Communist Party about the first of November 1938.

Q. Was that resignation accepted?

A. It was torn up.

Q. And was there any discussion with reference to your resignation between you and any members of the Communist [1671] Party?

A. James Murphy, the Secretary, came around and said, "Well, I tore up your resignation." He said, "I think you had better consider it and think it over."

Q. What did you say?

A. I said that I didn't intend to stay in.

Q. Did he then say he would accept the resignation?

A. No, he did not.

Q. Did the Communist Party take any action either to accept your resignation or to expel you?

A. They expelled me in July, 1939.

Q. How do you fix the date?

A. What's that?

Q. How do you fix the date?

A. I have the expulsion here.

Q. May I see it, please?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Wilmot, the second paragraph of the statement reads, as follows: "Because of non-payment of dues and failure to attend branch meetings

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

You have been out of good standing for several months. The action to expel, however, follows the decision made in 1938 in which certain qualifications were placed upon your continued membership in the Party, qualifications by which you have failed to abide."

Could you state, please, what those qualifications were, [1672] if any, that were placed upon your continued membership?

A. Well, I had been up several—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Just a moment! May I ask who signed that letter and is it on the letterhead of the Communist Party?

The Witness: Well, "Central Control Committee, Communist Party, signed by Harold C. Spring, Chairman."

Will you repeat your question, please?

Mr. Grossman: Will you read it, Mr. Reporter?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. Yes, I can state them. I had been up several times in front of disciplinary committees for fighting the Party line on various things where I thought they were wrong and had been brow-beaten by a bunch of fellows, and so forth; and twice I agreed to do things, as I stated yesterday, and those were the qualifications under which I was to continue in there. And I say, I hadn't paid dues for many months and under the constitution that was going at that time I was automatically out anyway when I got this expulsion and had been for several months.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. I still am not sure what the qualifications were. What is it that you were supposed to do or to continue doing in order to be allowed to remain in the Communist Party? [1673]

A. I was not supposed to criticize the leadership. I was not supposed to fight them in any way and I was supposed to abide by the decisions of the Editorial Board on the Labor New Dealer, of which I was the Editor.

Q. Was that all?

A. That's the—to my recollection, that's all I remember.

Q. Do you remember when those qualifications were imposed? A. No, I do not.

Q. Will you please describe the circumstances—with draw that. In your direct testimony you stated, I think in substance, that your Communist Party Unit selected you to act as Editor of the Labor New Dealer, is that correct?

A. That is correct; yes.

Q. Can you tell me more about how that came about? Do you know how the Unit happened to take this question up?

A. Yes. As I stated yesterday, I had been recruited into the Party by Kenneth Fitzgerald. He ran the Unit. They wanted him to take the paper first, but, as he stated, he didn't want to stick his neck out because he had been a former candidate for office, a Communist Party candidate, for office in Portland. It was a small unit, about seven peo-

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

ple. Perhaps I was next to him, I was the only one that was qualified, knew enough about newspaper work, to take over the paper. That [1674] is how I was first selected there.

Q. How long after this discussion, the first discussion of this question in the unit, did you take over the job of editor of the Labor New Dealer?

A. Well, I should say about three weeks.

Q. Will you please explain, Mr. Wilmot, how you could have been selected for the job of Editor of the Labor New Dealer, and taken that job approximately three weeks after you were selected by your Unit of the Communist Party, when you joined the Communist Party after Christmas of 1937, and you became Editor of the Labor New Dealer in October of 1937?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question, if your Honor please. It is long and confusing, and doesn't appear to be a question at all.

Mr. Grossman: The confusion is not in the question, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take it. Let us see if the dates are right.

Mr. Grossman: They are right from the transcript.

Presiding Inspector: You corrected the transcript in one way this morning:

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you want to correct the date on which you became the Editor of the Labor New Dealer as being four days before October 1, 1937? Do you want to correct that date? [1675]

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. To the best of my memory—I am trying to refresh my memory a moment—I became Editor of it for the first issue of the Labor New Dealer that came out October first, or October 1, 1937.

Q. Do you want to correct that date?

A. No.

Q. Will you please answer the question, then?

A. I joined the Communist Party right after Christmas 1937. I was in all the time until I took the paper over.

Q. Didn't you become Editor of the paper at least two months before you joined the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Do you contend that October 1, 1937 is later than a little bit after Christmas of 1937?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that as argumentative.

Presiding Inspector: He is trying to correct his recollection. There is a mistake there somewhere.

A. Well, it had to be in 1936, then.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What might have been in 1936?

A. When I joined the Communist Party.

Q. Are you testifying it was in 1936?

A. I frankly can't remember.

Q. Do you have any other explanation to make, Mr. Wilmot? [1676] A. I have not.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that. Is there any evidence that counsel has as to the date he joined the Communist Party?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Mr. Grossman: Only his testimony.

Presiding Inspector: This is all proper, I think. People make mistakes in recollection of dates.

Mr. Grossman: And about recollection of other things taking place, too.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. All witnesses do that, are apt to do it. We haven't perfect memories, any of us.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You are certain, are you—

Presiding Inspector: I notice that I made mistakes about the testimony that is given, and I also noticed that you have too.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You are certain, are you, Mr. Wilmot, before you became Editor of the Labor New Dealer that this question was raised and a decision was made in your Communist Party Unit that you should become such an Editor? A. I am positive of that.

[1677]

Q. When did you arrive in Portland?

A. The first time?

Q. Yes. A. 1934.

Q. And did you leave Portland? A. I did.

Q. When?

A. I left about a month after I arrived here. I believe I arrived here the first of October or thereabouts, I went back to Los Angeles shortly before Christmas.

Q. You had come to Portland in '34 from Los Angeles then?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I had come originally from Minneapolis to Los Angeles to Portland.

Q. How long had you been in Los Angeles before you came to Portland in '34?

A. Before I came to Portland in '34?

Q. Yes.

A. I was only there, I believe, two weeks.

Q. And how long were you in Los Angeles after leaving Portland in '34? A. All winter.

Q. Then did you return to Portland?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you remained there continuously?

A. That's right. No, I think in '36 I went back on a [1678] visit to St. Paul, Minnesota.

Q. When did you return to St. Paul, Minnesota? A. '36.

Q. I mean, what month, if you can remember?

A. In June.

Q. How long were you there?

A. About three weeks.

Q. And then did you return to Portland?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And did you remain continuously in Portland then after that?

A. I have never been out of Portland since then with the exception of minor trips; a couple of Party affairs in Seattle and down the Valley and so forth.

Q. Did you ever tell anyone that there were reasons why you could never return to Minneapolis?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that. There is no foundation laid for it. There is no indication here, no evidence here—

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I think that you should give him some clew. This is a question right out of a clear sky.

Mr. Grossman: I can't at this time, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. I will exclude it at this time.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon? [1679]

Presiding Inspector: I will exclude it at this time. Of course, if there is any reason why he shouldn't return, it is open to you to bring that out.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Is there any reason why you can not return or consider it undesirable for you to return to Minneapolis?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the form of the question, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A: Certainly not. I am thinking of going back there now.

Presiding Inspector: Now you may ask him if you wish to—

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. (Interposing) Did you ever tell—

Presiding Inspector: Ask it this way: Do you recall or do you have any recollection?

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you have any recollection of telling anyone that there are reasons why you could never return to Minneapolis?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I believe I told people several times there were reasons why I didn't want to.

Q. But you never told anyone that there were reasons why you couldn't? A. No, sir.

Q. What were the reasons that you didn't want to? [1680] A. I didn't like the climate.

Q. Where were you during the 1936 maritime strike? A. I was in Portland.

Q. During the entire strike?

A. I don't recollect much about that strike. I didn't pay a lot of attention to it.

Q. What were you doing at that time?

A. Working on the WPA Writers' Project.

Q. During what periods were you on WPA?

A. During what periods?

Q. Yes.

A. I quit when I went back to Minneapolis in 1936 and then I wired and asked them if I could have the job back again. They said I could. So when I came back, I believe it was in July, I went right back on the WPA Writers' Project.

Q. July of 1936? A. Yes.

Q. And then you remained there for how long?

A. Until September of 1940.

Q. Continuously?

A. Well, with the exception of a week I took off to work on the Labor New Dealer at the beginning when I thought I was going to get paid.

Q. And outside of that week that you took off you worked continuously on WPA?

A. That's correct. [1681]

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Is that right? A. That's correct.

Q. Were you a relief or non-relief employee during this period?

A. I was a relief employee originally and about a week after I went on the paper, or two weeks I was promoted—taken off of relief status and put on as a non-relief supervisor.

Q. Did you during the time that you were working on the WPA or during part of that time edit the Labor New Dealer and also at the same time do your WPA job?

A. Yes, sir; in every case.

Q. Can you tell me how so far as time is concerned you reconciled these two jobs?

A. We had no requirements. At that time, we didn't have to keep regular office hours. We had a minimum. The ordinary writers—I was a re-write man. We had a minimum of 1900 words a week specified by WPA regulations, and I had to re-write about, oh, about 10,000 words a week and they didn't ask how many hours I took or anything so long as you did that at that time. Then later they specified that you should work six hours a day and you could work wherever you wanted to, and then later I had to get the Labor New Dealer out mostly at night because they put me on a job for a while where I had to stay in the WPA office and supervise some other [1682] people.

Q. Do you know whether there were any rules which forbade at that time your holding another job while you were employed on WPA?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. There were no rules. I also did publicity for various other things and I took it up with the boss and it was all right.

Q. He told you there were no WPA rules which would restrict your having another pay job while you were employed on WPA?

A. There were for the certified people. They were allowed under WPA regulations to make \$50.00 a month in excess of their regular allowance, but as far as the non-certified people were concerned they could have made any amount that was possible.

Q. When you first joined the Communist Party what unit were you put into?

A. They called it a Cultural Unit. It was the unit of artists and writers, most of them WPA employees.

Q. And later you were put in what you called the Maritime or Waterfront Branch, is that correct, yes.

A. The Waterfront Branch, that is correct, yes.

Q. When was the first time you ever met Harry Bridges?

A. I believe about the second week in October, 1937.

Q. Were you then employed on the Labor New Dealer? [1683]

A. I was.

Q. Where did you meet him?

A. Norse Hall, Portland, on the stage.

Q. Which hall? Norse?

A. Norse Hall.

Q. Do you remember the day of the week?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. No, I do not.

Q. Was it at a regular meeting of the Portland Longshoremen's Union?

A. I believe that was a special meeting, if I remember rightly.

Q. What conversation did you have with Harry Bridges or did he have with you at that time?

A. Harry Pilcher introduced me to him as the Editor of the paper and Bridges said, as I stated yesterday, that "Is this one of those horrible Communists?" or "awful Communists". That may not be the exact word he used.

Q. Is that the entire conversation?

A. No. We discussed—I said at that time that I thought Mr. Bridges was a great labor leader and I told him how glad I was to meet him.

Q. You mean you don't think so now?

A. I certainly do not.

Q. At the time you went to work for the Labor New Dealer did Harry Pilcher have any connection with the paper? [1684]

A. Harry Pilcher got himself elected Chairman of the Editorial Board. It was a five-man board.

Q. For how long was he a member of that board?

A. He was a member of the Editorial Board until after I left the paper. [1685]

Q. During the entire time that you were on the paper Mr. Pilcher was one of the Editorial Board?

A. Right.

Q. Was he Chairman of the Editorial Board for the entire time? A. Yes, sir.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. When was the next time you met Harry Bridges?

A. I can't remember exactly. Every time that Bridges came to town I saw him.

Q. When was the next occasion that you remember the details of?

Mr. Del Guercio: What is the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. Well, I remember going up to the longshoremen's office on the 12th floor of the Guardian Building one time and listening to some idle conversation. I had no definite dealings with Mr. Bridges, but I was a _____ in my capacity as Editor of the paper.

Q. When was that?

A. That was—as I stated before, I don't remember when the next time was.

Q. Nothing significant happened there?

A. What?

Q. Nothing significant happened there? [1686]

A. Nothing significant happened, no.

Q. When was the next occasion you remember the details of?

A. I believe Mr. Bridges was in town about three times that winter, before the spring of 1938, possibly four times, and I saw him once in Captain E. B. O'Grady's office on the 7th floor of the Guardian Building.

Q. Do you remember any of the details of that?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. No, except that Captain O'Grady was telling him some of his troubles. I was in the outer office and the door was open.

Q. When was the next time?

A. I don't remember any of the meetings, specific dates, if you want that, throughout that winter.

Q. Take the next year. A. 1938?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, the month of April—that was very significant because it was during the month of April that I saw Bridges in the Lennox Hotel, early in the month of April. I don't remember the exact date on that. It was about the 20th of April when I saw him in the Roosevelt Hotel.

Q. Let us stick to the Lennox Hotel first.

A. All right.

Q. Can you fix the date with reference to any event? [1687]

A. I can't fix the date, exact date; no.

Q. Is there any way in which you would be able to fix the exact date if you checked the date of any event?

A. If I had a complete file of the Labor New Dealer I would be able to; yes.

Q. What would there be in the file that would give you the date?

A. Every time that Mr. Bridges came to town I was ordered to put something in the paper about him, or run his picture.

Q. By reading that article on Bridges being in town would you know which occasion was the

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

one on which you saw him at the Lennox Hotel?

A. I believe I would. I am not certain until I read them.

Q. Can you recall that there was something written in the Labor New Dealer concerning Mr. Bridges on the occasion when you saw him at the Lennox Hotel?

A. I don't believe there was anything in there at that time; that certainly wouldn't be written up in the paper.

Q. I didn't ask you whether the meeting at the Lennox Hotel was written up. I asked whether there was a story in the paper about him derived from that trip of his to Portland.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that. The meeting at the Lennox Hotel was certainly an event connecting him with Bridges.

Mr. Grossman: Is this an objection or some kind of a [1638] comment?

Presiding Inspector: I don't know. I will take it, though, if he can recall.

A. As I explained, I worked about 16 hours a day at that time and I had attended many meetings. Naturally, when I had anything to do with Bridges personally I remember those occasions. But I don't remember the exact words. I wrote thousands of words in that paper, and I can't remember everything that is in it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Then your testimony is that it was in the early part of April?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. The best of my knowledge is that it was in the early part of April; yes.

Q. Can you be any more specific now than the early part of April?

A. I don't believe so; not unless I had the files of the paper.

Q. When you say the "early part" do you mean in the first ten days?

A. I should say about the 12th, somewhere around there.

Q. You say about the 12th?

A. I don't wish to be exact on that because I cannot. I know it was in April.

Q. All right. Now, will you describe the occasion, [1689] please, that you saw Mr. Bridges in the Lennox Hotel, with the introductory material that will explain how you happened to see him there?

A. Well, Pilcher told me there was going to be a meeting of the Top Fraction of the Communist Party in the Lennox Hotel.

Q. When, with reference to the time of the meeting, did he tell you about that?

A. He told me to come up whenever I could and get a couple of other fellows.

Q. Was it the same day that he told you about it?

A. No.

Q. The day before?

A. Yes; the night before.

Q. Did he tell you when you should come up?

A. He stopped at my house and told me to be

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

there the next day. I said, "What time?" He said "Be there around noon if you can." I went there shortly after noon.

Q. Did he give you a room number?

A. No, he did not.

Q. You mean he merely said "Hotel Lennox"?

A. That is correct.

Q. All right. Did he give you the names of the people to bring to the meeting with you?

A. Jimmie Fantz—he told me to bring him if I saw him. In the meantime Fantz had been contacted by somebody, and Fantz [1690] had the room number, so I went up with him.

Q. Did you go up with anyone else besides Fantz? A. Leo Hemingway was along too.

Q. And you arrived at what time?

A. About one o'clock.

Q. And when you got to the room who was there?

A. Mowrey, Jack Mowrey, Howard Bodine, Charles Fantz, John Fougrouse; and there were some companions of Bridges there whom I did not know and to whom I was not introduced.

Q. Was Joe Ring there? A. Yes.

Q. Bridges was there? A. That is right.

Q. What happened after you got up to the room?

A. Mr. Bridges had his hat and coat on. He went out. He said to Pilcher, "Jo-Jo will tell you what to do."

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

I was standing behind Pilcher, that is how I heard. We went down the hall to another room.

Q. Before you go to that, how long after you arrived did Bridges leave? A. Right away.

Q. Then you went down the hall to another room? A. Correct.

Q. Do you know whose room it was?

A. No, I do not. The boys used the Lennox Hotel quite a lot. [1691]

Q. Do you know whose room it was that you went to first? A. I believe it was Joe Ring's.

Q. Do you know, or do you just believe?

A. I believe.

Q. What makes you believe that?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, he has just said he didn't know, but he believes it was Joe Ring's.

Mr. Grossman: I submit I have a right to know what the basis of his belief is.

Presiding Inspector: I think you can ask him if there is anything that recalls this to his mind. He is giving a faint recollection. He has already expressed himself to you.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You had some basis, I assume, for that?

A. He took off his coat and hat, and hung them up, and changed his shirt while in there, so it should have been his room, I believe.

Q. When you say you believe, you mean you have some doubt about his changing his shirt, and so on?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I am certain he changed his shirt before the afternoon was over. It might have been somebody else's shirt.

Q. All right. Then you went down to another room. What happened at this other room? First, who went to the other room, everybody except Bridges?

A. No. Bridges left with three men that I didn't know.

Q. With how many men? [1692]

A. I think it was three.

Q. And everyone else went to this other room?

A. Yes; all the Portland people went to the other room, with the exception of Joe Ring, and he was not from Portland.

Q. What transpired in this other room?

A. Ring appointed Fantz Chairman. There was a little by-play about that. We immediately started to discuss the general situation there, and the need was expressed by Ring, and the others, for getting rid of John Brost and Regional Director O'Grady.

Q. Did any of them quote Bridges as having any ideas or opinions on this question?

A. Yes.

Q. Who quoted him and what was said?

A. Well, Ring brought up the idea of his removal. I knew enough to believe that Mr. O'Grady was a pretty powerful fellow. He, Ring, said "Don't worry about that. Harry will take care of that."

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Did anyone express any opinion as to Bridges' ideas on removing either Brost or O'Grady? A. I didn't get that.

Q. Was any opinion expressed as to Bridges' views on removing Brost or O'Grady?

A. Yes. There was a general discussion on it all around on everybody's part. [1693]

Q. Who said what about Bridges' views on that subject?

A. Ring was the one that did the talking on that.

Q. Is that all Ring said on this question?

A. No, no. Ring talked on the question.

Q. I mean on the question of Bridges' views.

A. Bridges' views?

Q. Yes.

A. He said Bridges would take care of them; that they were as good as gotten.

Q. You got the implication that Bridges wanted to get rid of O'Grady and Brost?

A. That is not the implication; the implication was that we, as a Fraction, should arrive at a decision that O'Grady and Brost should go, and that Mr. Bridges would ratify that decision. That is what was brought out.

Q. You got the clear impression from what Joe Ring said that the decision of your Fraction would be accepted by Bridges and he would carry it out?

A. That is right.

Mr. Del Guercio: That isn't an impression that

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

he got. The witness has testified that that is what Joe Ring said.

Mr. Grossman: I think the record speaks for itself and Mr. Del Guercio need not argue every time an answer is given.

Presiding Inspector: Let it stand. Go ahead.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember anything else that Joe Ring, or any- [1694] one else said, that specifically described Bridges' attitude on this general question?

A. Yes. There was something said about Bridges didn't want to put O'Grady on in the first place, but that he was forced on him. There was a great argument about just how—

Q. (Interposing) Before we get to the argument—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) If your Honor please, I object to this. The witness is answering the question and he hasn't completed it.

Mr. Grossman: If you will listen to the question you will see that it was not responsive.

Presiding Inspector: There is no need to argue.

Mr. Grossman: I don't think these interruptions will get us anywhere. It is obvious that the point where I stopped the witness was the beginning of the unresponsive answer to the question.

Presiding Inspector: Proceed.

Mr. Del Guercio: The Court should decide that.

Presiding Inspector: There is no need of argu-

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

ing about this. I will overrule Mr. Del Guercio's objection and you may ask the next question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Who said that?

A. Repeat the question.

Mr. Grossman: Read the last answer, Mr. Reporter.

(The answer was read by reporter as above recorded.) [1695]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. I want to know who said that about Bridges not wanting to put on O'Grady? A. Joe Ring.

Q. And did he state who forced O'Grady on Bridges?

A. I am not positive of that. I believe he said Brophy did.

Q. All right. Then you had a discussion in that meeting. And what were the conclusions of your discussion, if any? A. Brost was to go.

Q. Was O'Grady to go?

A. O'Grady was to go.

Q. Were they to go at the same time?

A. No, they were not.

Q. In what order?

A. Brost was to go first.

Q. And O'Grady when?

A. As soon as they could arrange it.

Q. And what was required to be arranged between the time that Brost would go and O'Grady would go?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I was supposed to get Brost's job.

Q. And who was to have O'Grady's job?

A. That was not decided.

Q. Was this done on the theory that there would still be men occupying the positions that Brost and O'Grady held, [1696-7-8] or was one of those positions to be eliminated?

A. Ring said that there had been some talk of eliminating the Regional Director's job; that there definitely would have to be someone in an organizational capacity to take the same job that Brost did.

Q. In other words, definitely you were to have Brost's job?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, was this decision absolutely definite, that you were to have it, or was it left up in the air in some way?

A. I stated that it was to be ratified by Bridges.

Q. But the meeting was operating, was it not, on the theory that any decision of this fraction was to be ratified by Bridges?

A. That's right.

Q. All right. Then, so far as the fraction was concerned, it was a definite decision because they operated on the theory that anything they decided would be carried into effect by Bridges?

A. No. It was not a definite decision, because I balked on it. I didn't want Brost's job and Ring told me, he says, "You'll do what you are told". And I said, "Well, I will never fill Brost's job."

Q. Was it left on that note, that you were still re- [1699] fusing to take the job?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And was that the reason why you went to see Bridges, to discuss the question of whether you should take the job?

A. I stated yesterday that I don't recall clearly the incidents after that. I believe that I saw Bridges with Ring up in the Longshoremen's Union, but I am not certain and I don't want to be quoted on that, the way we talked about that.

Q. So you don't recall definitely whether or not you ever did have a discussion with Bridges on the question of your taking Brost's job?

A. No. I can't state that. I don't care to say that.

Q. You remember, however, don't you, what your testimony was on that yesterday, that you referred to giving Bridges your qualifications yesterday?

A. I said I believed that Joe Ring and I saw Bridges within the next twenty-four hours and that Joe Ring spoke to him about it—was what I testified to yesterday.

Q. But your testimony now is that you are not sure whether that took place?

A. I am not certain. I am not absolutely certain.

Q. Do you think you did, though? A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any recollection, however vague, of what was said at this meeting?

A. Well, Ring said, "The kid here doesn't think we ought [1700] to fire Brost". That's what he said, to the best of my recollection.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Do you recall anything else that was said?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall what the conclusion, if any, of the meeting was?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall whether Bridges expressed any sentiments on getting rid of Brost or accepting you?

A. I believe that Bridges used an expletive in connection with Mr. Brost.

Q. You got the impression that Mr. Bridges wanted to get rid of Brost, at least?

A. I had always had that impression for some time.

Q. When did you first get that impression?

A. Well, E. B. O'Grady had told me about a month before that he was afraid of John May's job, that Bridges was going to "get" him.

Q. Was that the first time you got the impression that Bridges wanted to "get" Brost out?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. When was the next time you saw Harry Bridges?

A. I think that was around—I think that closed meeting was around the 20th of April. I am not positive of that exact date either. But there was a closed meeting at the auditorium, which was participated in by the Woodworkers [1701] and Longshoremen.

Q. Just a moment! Before you go on any further, how long was this occasion, the closed meeting, after the meeting in the Lennox Hotel?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Well, I said that I didn't know the exact date of the meeting in the Lennox Hotel, but I thought it was about the 12th.

Q. Then you figure approximately a week?

A. Yes.

Q. Elapsed between the two meetings?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. Are you more definite about the time between the two meetings than you are about the April 12th date?

Presiding Inspector: Do you think that helps, a comparison in his mind of that kind?

Mr. Grossman: It might. He might be very clear on the question of the week. It may be the same day of the week or something else that might make it clear in his memory.

Presiding Inspector: I think the general statement is that he isn't very clear about these dates.

Mr. Grossman: All right. We will abandon that question.

Presiding Inspector: It is rather difficult, you know, to—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) What is that?

Presiding Inspector: It is rather difficult, to compare [1702] degrees of vague recollection as to dates.

By Mr. Grossman:

A. All right, now. I interrupted you. You were going to discuss—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) It was merely suggestive. You understood that.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Now, did you see Bridges at this meeting at the auditorium? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it inside the meeting that you saw him?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you have any discussion at the meeting with him?

A. Oh, no. He talked for about two hours and I just listened to the speech. That was all.

Q. After April when was the next time that you saw him? A. That very same night.

Q. That very same night? A. Yes.

Q. What were the circumstances that brought about the meeting?

A. Well, Harry Jackson took me up there along with Harry Pilcher to the Roosevelt Hotel.

Q. Where did you meet Harry Jackson? [1703]

A. At the auditorium, on the outside—

Q. (Interposing) After the meeting?

A. It was in the foyer after the meeting.

Q. Where did you meet Pilcher?

A. Pilcher was at the meeting, sitting right alongside me.

Q. Immediately after the meeting you left the auditorium to go up to see Bridges?

A. No. We stayed and talked. We talked to several people. I don't recall off-hand. All Communists. We had a little discussion there about—there was considerable—it was quite a "hot" meeting and we talked about it.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Was this an open meeting for the public?

A. It was a closed meeting.

Q. You are sure of that? A. I am sure.

Q. It was in the Portland Auditorium?

A. It was a very loose gate. It was technically closed, but lots of people who were not members of either organization were there.

Q. I see. All right. Then who apparently took the lead in taking you to a meeting with Harry Bridges? A. Harry Jackson.

Q. Jackson or Pilcher? A. Jackson.

Q. Where did you see Bridges? [1704]

A. In the Roosevelt Hotel.

Q. Do you happen to know whether it was Bridges' room in the Roosevelt Hotel?

A. I don't know whether it was or not. I couldn't be certain of that. I don't think it was. I think maybe it was perhaps Matt Meehan's room.

Q. Was Matt Meehan around?

A. No, he was not.

Q. When you got there was Bridges there?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Who was present at this meeting?

A. Pilcher, Jackson, Bridges and myself.

Q. No one else? A. That's right.

Q. And about what time did you get there?

A. Well, I am not certain. It was late; about 11:00 o'clock, I believe.

Q. And how did the conversation start?

A. Well, I had—originally, as I stated yester-

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

day, Jackson said that he was going to take me up there to "bust me on" Bridges, and we went up and Jackson told Bridges about the trouble that I was having with the paper. That very same day I said there had been a thousand subscriptions cancelled. And I believe that Bridges said "Well, get people out and sell them at the mill gates." These were sawmill men that [1705] CIO sawmill men that cancelled the paper on the ground that it was full of Communist propaganda. And Bridges said "Put them out at the sawmill gates and sell them."

So we discussed what could be done to keep the paper from going under, because we had no money or anything. I believe I asked Bridges if there wasn't some way that we could—yes, I did—if we couldn't get some financial support from the CIO. And he said, "No, that there wasn't any that he knew of."

Q. Is it correct that the first things you discussed were the paper and the loss of circulation and the getting of money for it and so forth?

A. That's right.

Q. Now, let us go back to the discussion that you had with Jackson before you were taken up there. You made some statement that Jackson had made as to why he was taking you up there. Will you repeat that, please? And tell me when it was made and who was present.

A. Harry Pilcher, Jackson and I were alone at the time.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilnrot.)

Q. This was after the auditorium meeting?

A. That's right.

Q. But before you went up to Bridges?

A. That's right.

Q. What was all the conversation on that subject?

A. Well, Jackson was going up to see him, and he said, [1706] "Let's take Bob up and bust him on Bridges". I don't know what that expression means. I know what I think it means.

Q. What do you think it means?

A. That means that I was going to be initiated into the inner circles.

Q. Let us return to the Roosevelt Hotel. Do you remember how the conversation got around to the question of you and the Communist Party? You said it started on the question of the paper. Do you remember how it got around to the question of you and the Communist Party?

A. Well, Jackson said that they had had considerable trouble with me, but he thought that I was going to be all right. And we hadn't discussed anything else. The whole thing was a Party discussion, what our reaction to it would be.

Q. What do you mean when you say "the whole thing" was a Party discussion?

A. Because when I walked into the room to talk with Bridges, with the trade union organizer for the Communist Party, we certainly were going to discuss things as they affected the Communist Party.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Is that your only basis for making that statement? A. Well, that's—

Q. (Interposing) Is it your only basis? [1707]

A. No. We even discussed—he even discussed what was going on in Seattle, but I didn't pay any attention to that. I believe I was reading a newspaper while he was talking about that.

Q. Are you giving that as a basis for your statement that it was a Party discussion?

A. I am giving it as a basis that it was a Party discussion, the fact that I told you that Jackson always kept himself as anonymous as possible and always never came out in the open anywhere.

Q. Am I correct in stating your testimony, then, that the reason you say it was a Party discussion was because Jackson was there because of who Jackson was? A. That's right.

Q. All right. Now, I am interested in all this discussion on the question with you and the Communist Party or Jackson's trouble with you. What else was said?

A. Well, Pilcher said that "Bob doesn't always follow the Party line, but" he said, "He's a good hard worker". I remember he said that. "He gets his paper out and does a lot of other work besides", and he says, "We'll straighten him out". A sort of paternal attitude he had about it.

Q. Did he ask Bridges to do anything with reference to you? A. No, he did not. [1708]

Q. Did he ask Bridges to lay down the line to you? A. No, he did not.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Did he ask Bridges to discipline you in any way?

A. No. Bridges then said—that was when Bridges said “Well, we Communists have got to stick together. We have got to have some discipline”, and he said, “You have got to do what you are told or we won’t have any organization at all”.

Q. Was there any discussion at this meeting about this Communist Party statement that you said you were asked to put in the paper?

A. Yes.

Q. The statement hadn’t actually been put in the paper, had it?

A. No. The idea was that I got a statement from them about every week. I was fighting the Party on the idea that they should not put Communist statements directly from the Party in that paper. And every week, why, there would be something that they would say that the Red Squad had prowled their office, and I don’t know how much of it was true. I don’t know whether the Red Squad had prowled their office or not. But I would get these statements to run. There was always a statement on tap and they would come up and put them in my mail box up there. And the general line was that I had refused to run-out-and-out Party stuff, Party statements, and that was [1709] discussed at that meeting. Pilcher said that he thought that I should run them and Bridges said he thought I should run the statements, too.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. In your direct testimony you referred to a particular statement, one that was brought out by a man named Van Lydegraf.

A. Yes. Every statement that was brought up there Van Lydegraf signed it.

Q. And you referred in your direct examination also to a particular statement about the Police Department of Portland ransacking or raiding or doing something with the Communist Party headquarters. Were there several statements on that, or was that a particular one?

A. There were three of them. They were in the Guardian Building and they maintained that they were called on every night and that somebody was having a dictaphone put in there. There were several statements. When I say "the" Van Lydegraf statement I mean that categorically.

Q. Let me refer you to your testimony on direct examination and see which statements, if any, you were referring to. "One of the matters that we were discussing was the fact that some of the Portland Police were supposed to go over and raid the Communist headquarters and take some stuff out of there or something. So Murphy told around and he told me that I would have to run a statement by the Communists in the Labor [1710] New Dealer, and which I declined to do. I said I wouldn't run such a statement. They made me run it." Now, does that refer to a particular statement?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. That refers to the one which finally appeared in the issue of the paper that is in evidence there.

Q. And did it appear before or after your meeting with Harry Bridges in the Roosevelt Hotel?

A. After my meeting with Bridges.

Q. Was it discussed at your meeting with Bridges at the Roosevelt Hotel?

A. The general policy of putting the Communists in the position where they could come out and protest in our paper against what they termed "Red Squad persecution and under cover agents" and so forth was discussed at that meeting. And it was a week later, I believe, or in the 28th issue—April 28th issue—I ran a statement. It's in that paper there.

Q. Do you remember whether this particular statement or this particular occurrence was discussed in your meeting with Bridges?

A. I believe that the raids in general were discussed and what my line on the paper should be in connection with writing them up. I was perfectly willing—I remember saying that I was perfectly willing to write them up myself, but I didn't want direct Party statements in there and I didn't want to quote anybody in the paper. I was willing to write [1711] it as a news story, in other words.

Q. And did Bridges express any opinion on this?

A. He said I ought to run it.

Q. He said you ought to run the Communist Party statement?

A. That's right.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Was there much discussion on this question at that meeting with Bridges?

A. There was considerable. I said that—"What am I going to do if I haven't any circulation? I can't keep the paper going", and I said, "I think the paper is valuable to the CIO and it should be kept going, and Communist stuff—obvious sort of Communist stuff should be kept out of it". And Bridges said that he thought that a thing like that ought to be in there, and I believe he mentioned his difficulties with the Portland Red Squad.

Q. Was there anything else discussed at this meeting?

A. Bridges said that—he asked me, maybe I could go down to San Francisco and work on a "good paper", and I took that to mean the "Voice of the Federation". He didn't definitely state that. "If I behaved myself".

Q. Did he elaborate on "behaving yourself"?

A. No.

Q. When was the next time you saw Harry Bridges?

A. On the, I believe it was, the morning of the 28th— [1712] April 28th when that issue came out.

Q. The morning of the 28th? A. Yes.

Q. Was that the time when he discussed with you what would go in the paper? A. Yes.

Q. Was that the time when he told you what should go in the paper? A. Yes.

Q. Then you wrote the various articles that were

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

involved during the time that you talked to Harry Bridges at the end of that day, is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, is it your testimony that Harry Bridges had called you to O'Grady's office to discuss this?

A. No; not to O'Grady's office. We went up to the Labor New Dealer office and talked, because naturally we wouldn't talk these things in O'Grady's office.

Q. I see. Why did you say "naturally" you wouldn't discuss this in O'Grady's office?

A. In E. B. O'Grady's office?

Q. Yes.

A. Because whenever Bridges would talk to me about a thing like that, or anyone else there, the Communist line would naturally creep in by inference, at least, and it was [1713] no secret to anybody up there that Bridges was going to "get" O'Grady and we certainly wouldn't discuss how we felt about O'Grady in O'Grady's office.

Q. You felt at that time that the editorial and the article appearing because of Bridges' instructions to you in the Labor New Dealer were the Communist line on the Bridges' case, is that it?

A. Definitely.

Q. Did you feel that such article and editorial could only be approved by Communists?

A. Well, the lumber workers didn't like it.

Q. Could you answer the question, please?

A. I believe so, that it could only be approved by Communists.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Yes. Or would only be approved by Communists?

A. I don't see what that had to do with it.

Q. You are the one that gave the answer, that you couldn't discuss this article or editorial in O'Grady's presence.

A. Bridges didn't care to discuss it. I had nothing to do with it.

Q. Did Bridges tell you that he didn't want to discuss this in O'Grady's office?

A. Naturally not. He said "I will meet you up in the Labor New Dealer office". That's why we went up there. [1714] We could have just as easily have gone down on the floor below.

Q. What was your basis for stating that Bridges didn't want to discuss this in O'Grady's office?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, the witness didn't say that Bridges said that.

Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that Bridges said that, Mr. Del Guercio, if you will listen.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, address the Court.

Mr. Grossman: I asked what his basis was for stating that. He stated it all right, this witness did, and I want to know his basis for stating it.

A. Because when we got up there Bridges said in the office "Now is the time"—and very emphatic about it—"That the Communists have got to step out and get going, and they can show their face now after the Supreme Court decision in Louisiana". He said, "Now, we can shoot the works". That

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

is what he said. He wasn't going to say that in front of O'Grady.

Q. You interpreted the article and editorial that Bridges told you you had to run as the Communists showing their face in Portland?

A. I certainly do, when he talked about the Portland Red Squad in the one article and all the people who they were supposed to be keeping to testify against him.

Q. When was the next time you met Harry Bridges? [1715]

A. I have never met Bridges from that day to this.

Q. How long have you held your present position? A. Since January.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. By the Columbia River District Council No. 5 of the International Woodworkers of America, CIO.

Q. Isn't this the group in the IWA that has been fighting Harry Bridges for some time?

A. They have been fighting the Communist Party, because they believe Harry Bridges to be at the bottom of it on the West Coast.

Q. Isn't that the group that has been trying to get the removal of Harry Bridges from his position with the CIO?

A. I have no definite knowledge as to that. I know that they are definitely against Harry Bridges, but I have never heard of any concerted move to get him out of the CIO on their part.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Isn't this the group that was condemned as an anti-labor force by the 1940 and 1941 conventions of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question. If the witness knows, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, that is so. [1716]

Mr. Grossman: Yes:

A. I believe the longshoremen—Bridges' longshoremen did condemn them, yes.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. In the 1940 and the 1941 conventions?

A. I am not certain of that. I think they did, yes.

Q. Is this the group that has severed or taken steps to sever its affiliation from the International Woodworkers of America?

A. They have certainly done it since I left Portland, if they have.

Q. Have they taken any steps to sever their affiliation from the International Woodworkers of America?

A. They have asked Philip Murray, the head of the CIO, to do something about their international officers who are Communists, yes.

Q. Have they taken any steps to stop payment of dues to their International Union?

A. They have their own organizing committee at the present time. [1717]

Q. Could you answer this question, please: Have they taken any steps to discontinue, or have they

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

discontinued these payments of dues to their International Union? A. Per capita tax; yes.

Q. You, yourself, are very hostile to Harry Bridges, are you not? A. I am, indeed.

Q. And you, yourself, are convinced that these policies of Harry Bridges are very bad for the labor movement?

A. I believe Harry Bridges is the greatest enemy the labor movement has.

Q. When was the first time you spoke to any representative of the FBI about giving a statement concerning Harry Bridges, or testifying in this hearing?

A. Well, I believe it was—I am not certain of the date—but I think it was last November.

Q. And what were the circumstances surrounding this meeting?

A. Well, as I recall, I went to the door and there they were, about eleven o'clock one night.

Q. Who was there?

A. A Mr. Coulter and Mr. Robey.

Q. Did you discuss this question with them at that time? A. I did.

Q. How long did the discussion last? [1718]

A. I believe half an hour.

Q. What was the first thing they said to you?

A. They wanted to know if I knew Harry Bridges.

Q. Did they ask what you knew about Harry Bridges? A. Yes.

Q. What did you tell them?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I told them substantially what I have testified to here.

Q. What happened at the end of the conversation? A. At the end of it?

Q. Yes. A. They left.

Q. Was any arrangement made as to future meeting?

A. Yes. I was to go up to the Federal Court House and make a statement.

Q. Had they taken notes of the conversation?

A. No.

Q. When were you to go up there?

A. I believe I had some publicity to write and they said I could come up whenever I got through with it. I think that was about three days later.

Q. And you did go up at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. And you did sign a statement at that time?

A. I didn't sign a statement at that time. [1719]

Q. You gave a statement?

A. I gave a statement.

Q. Was any arrangement made about your coming back again? A. No.

Q. Who was present at this meeting, the one at the FBI office?

A. Mr. Coulter, Mr. Robey and a stenographer.

Q. Did you subsequently sign that statement?

A. Subsequently signed it; yes.

Q. When?

A. I think that was about a week later.

Q. Pardon?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I believe that was about a week later.

Q. When you signed it did you have any discussion with them?

A. We discussed the Portland weather and that is about all.

Q. Nothing substantial about the case or Mr. Bridges? A. No; not anything in addition.

Q. Does this represent all the conferences you have had with representatives of the FBI on Bridges or the Bridges case?

A. On Bridges and the Bridges case?

Q. Yes. [1720]

A. Yes; that is all the discussion I have had with the exception of here.

Q. Have you ever had any discussion with Captain Keegan on Bridges or the Bridges case?

A. On Captain Keegan?

Q. With Captain Keegan.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that as having nothing to do with the issues in this case, as to who he discussed the matter with.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know whether it has or not. I will let him answer.

A. I never discussed the Bridges case with Captain Keegan.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you know Captain Keegan personally?

A. I have met Captain Keegan once.

Q. Did you ever discuss what you know about Bridges, or what you thought you knew about

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Bridges, with Mr. Norene or Mr. Bonham, of the Immigration Service?

A. I have never seen either one.

Q. Have you ever discussed the question of Bridges with Captain O'Dale or Mr. O'Dale, of the Portland Police Department?

A. I never have.

Q. Or with Mr. Brown of the Portland Police Department? [1721]

A. No.

Q. Or with Mr. Mumpower, of the Portland Police Department?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever discuss what you knew, or thought you knew, about Bridges or the Bridges case with Mr. Foss, of the Portland Longshoremen?

A. I have talked to Ed Foss about it; yes.

Q. When was the last time?

A. I don't think we have said anything about Bridges for a couple of weeks.

Q. How many different discussions have you had with him about Bridges?

A. Foss is a personal friend of mine. When we were talking things over about the labor movement, why Bridges usually comes into it.

Q. Did you ever discuss with him whether you should testify against Bridges?

A. No. He asked me whether I was going to testify, but I didn't discuss with him whether I should.

Q. Did you ever discuss with him your possibly testifying against Bridges before the FBI men came to see you?

A. No, I did not.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. At the time that this meeting you referred to in the Lennox Hotel took place, what was Harry Bridges' position in [1722] the CIO?

A. Well, he was Director.

Q. Pacific Coast Director? A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever given any written statement or affidavit to any other person concerning what you know about Harry Bridges and his possible Communist affiliation? A. I never have.

Q. Do you know a person named H. Wilmot, of Santa Cruz, California? A. I do not.

Q. Have you ever lived in Santa Cruz, California? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you quit your position with the WPA, or was it severed in some other way?

A. The Communists had me kicked out of it.

Q. Isn't it a fact that you were removed from WPA because of habitual drunkenness?

A. It is not true; definitely not true.

Q. Isn't it a fact that the WPA records show you were removed from WPA for habitual drunkenness?

A. The records of WPA show I was suspended for drunkenness, after having worked there for four years.

Q. Isn't it a fact that Harry Bridges, in discussing your work as Editor of Labor New Dealer, said that you would have [1723] to stop drinking so much or you couldn't remain editor of Labor New Dealer?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. I don't remember Bridges saying that; no.

Q. At the present time do you not have a lawsuit pending against the Labor New Dealer for money you claim is due you? A. I do; yes.

(Mr. Grossman: No more questions.)

Presiding Inspector: Anything further, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes; a few questions.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Brost subsequently removed from office after this meeting that you described?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear Harry Bridges say anything about the removal of Brost subsequent to that meeting?

A. After the meeting in the Lennox Hotel?

Q. Yes. A. No, I didn't.

Q. Did Bridges discuss the necessity of removing Brost at that closed meeting in the auditorium?

A. No, no.

Q. Did you ever hear Bridges say in any speech that he made that it was necessary to let his good friend, Johnny Brost, go? [1724]

A. I recollect something like that, but I don't remember the date of the occurrence. Yes, by golly, that night at the auditorium he did say that; that it was necessary to let his good friend, Johnny Brost, go.

Q. Brost was subsequently removed?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

A. Yes.

Q. How long after the Lennox Hotel meeting?

A. I asked Brost himself the other day, and he couldn't remember the exact date; so I certainly can't.

Q. Do you have any personal animosity toward Harry Bridges? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What has he done to you?

A. He hasn't done anything to me.

Q. What do you mean by "personal animosity?"

A. Well, I have spent most of my life in the labor movement. I think that I could learn to hate Mr. Bridges on the basis of his last longshore constitution they put over, as far as I am concerned.

Q. Does that in any way affect your testimony that you have given here? A. No, sir.

Q. Have you told the truth as to what occurred?

A. I have as far as I have been able; yes.

Q. Have you distorted anything? [1725]

A. I don't believe so; no.

Q. Would your animosity toward Bridges affect your testimony?

A. No, sir, I don't believe so.

Q. Do you know whether it would or not?

A. I know it would not. I wouldn't testify to anything that I didn't think was so just because I dislike the man.

Q. Has he ever done anything personally to you? A. No; definitely not.

Q. Have you ever done anything to him?

A. No.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. What is the basis of this animosity?

A. Well, as I recall, when I came out from Minnesota I thought Harry Bridges was a great labor leader, and that was one of the reasons why I wanted to come to the Coast. After I saw Mr. Bridges in action I began to doubt him; but I still thought I would go down the line as far as I could. I thought perhaps he might be right and I might be wrong. Gradually, because of the things I saw happening in the CIO; and good men who just wanted to work messed up with all this Communistic stuff, and everything, I began to think that they would be better off if there had never been a Bridges, as far as the labor movement was concerned. I saw what happened to my friend, Ed Foss, a longshoreman, and to Jimmy Brost. And I have seen such things going on and on, and I came to believe [1726] absolutely that there was no democracy about this man, Bridges, and he was just another dictator; and I don't believe there is a place in this country for dictators.

Q. You just don't like him, is that it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that doesn't affect your testimony in any way? A. No, sir.

Q. What you have told is the truth—I will repeat that again. A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I believe that you mentioned the April 28th issue of the paper. As a matter of fact, isn't it the April 22nd issue?

A. I haven't seen one of those until you

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

handed it to me here yesterday. I was under the impression that was April 28th.

Q. The impression I have may be wrong, but I think you stated it was April 28th.

Presiding Inspector: I think he said April 28th. Didn't you say that?

The Witness: Yes..

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. This article (indicating) appears in the issue of Friday, April 22nd.

A. I haven't seen one of those since I left there, [1727] until yesterday when you showed it to me. I saw the date wrong, I guess.

Q. And I also note that this statement from Clayton Van Lydegraf appears on page 4 of this issue. Is that the statement that you have been testifying about?

A. (Examining statement) Yes; that is the statement.

Q. Have you been promised anything by anybody, any person, group, for appearing here to testify?

A. No, sir. I think I lost my job by coming down here, is what I think.

Q. Has any Government Agent offered you any reward for appearing here to testify?

A. No, sir.

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to ask anything further?

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Are you a member of the American Newspaper Guild? A. I am not.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have other questions.

Mr. Grossman: Excuse me.

Presiding Inspector: I thought you had finished.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Wilmot, can you fix the date you joined the Communist Party?

A. No, I really can't. I believe it was in January or February, 1936. [1728]

Q. In any event, you are certain it was before you obtained this position on the Labor New Dealer?

A. Yes; because I never would have gotten it otherwise.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: Anything further?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.)

Recross Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Were you a member of the American Newspaper Guild at any time the last year?

A. No.

Q. Are you a member of any union now?

A. Yes.

Q. Which one?

A. Shipyard Workers, CIO.

Q. When did you become a member of that union? A. About three weeks ago.

(Testimony of Robert Patrick Wilmot.)

Q. Are you working in the industry.

A. No.

Mr. Grossman: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: Anything further, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: No.

Mr. Grossman: One more question, if I may.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Grossman: [1729]

Q. Is Ed Foss Secretary of that Union?

A. He is temporary Secretary, I believe. I don't know whether they elected any regular officers or not; I don't believe they have.

Mr. Grossman: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

Mr. Del Guercio: May the witness be excused?

Presiding Inspector: Yes; certainly.

(Witness excused.)

Presiding Inspector: We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: All right, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will call the next witness.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Del Guercio: This witness is a little hard of hearing, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: Can you hear me?

Mr. St. Clair (Witness): Yes—but louder.

Presiding Inspector: Stand and raise your right hand.